DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 040 PS 008 790

TITLE	Child and Family Services Act, 1974. Joint Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, and the Select Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, and the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Ninety-Third Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.; Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
PUB DATE	Aug 74
NOTE	457p.; Not available in hard copy due to print size of original; For related documents, see PS 008 791-799
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care; Child Care Centers; Child Welfare; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Legislation; Family Day Care; *Family Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Health Services; Infants; Medical Services; Migrant Welfare Services; Minority Groups; Nutrition; Parents; Preschool Children; Social Services; Standards; State Federal Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*Child and Family Services Act; Legislative Hearings

ABSTRACT

This document records proceedings of the joint hearings on the Child and Family Services Act, 1974 (bills S.3754 and H.R.15882). The bills would provide for child care, health, nutritional, educational, and other services for children and their families on a voluntary basis. Included are the texts of both bills, a brief section-by-section analysis of S.3754, witnesses' testimony from August 8 and August 9, 1974, statements presented, and additional information (including related papers, communications, and selected tables). An appendix contains a summary report of current Department of Health, Education and Welfare activities on behalf of children, and the report of a national symposium on implementing child development programs. (SB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

7-76

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1974

JOINT HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE

AND THE

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY,
AND MIGRATORY LABOR

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 3754

TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

AUGUST 8 AND 9, 1974

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
47-091 WASHINGTON : 1975

ED127040

PS008790

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont

MARIO T. NOTO, *Staff Director*
HERBERT N. JASPER, *General Counsel*
ROY H. MILLENSON, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine

ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III, *Professional Staff Member*
JOHN K. SCALES, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND MIGRATORY LABOR

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
ALAN CRANSTON, California
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine

ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
J. GLENN BEALL, JR., Maryland

RICHARD E. JOHNSON, *Counsel*
JOHN K. SCALES, *Minority Counsel*

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida

EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut

JACK G. DUNCAN, *Counsel*

CONTENTS

Text of:	Page
S. 3754	4
Introductory statements	66
Section-by-section analysis	77
H.R. 15882	83

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 1974

White, Dr. Sheldon, H., A.B., M.A., Ph. D., professor of psychology, Harvard University	154
Caldwell, Dr. Bettye, professor of education, University of Arkansas; director of the Center for Early Development and Learning, Little Rock, Ark.	172
Jewett, Patricia, president, Vermont Child Care "76" Campaign; executive director, Champlain Valley Family Development Corp., Burlington, Vt	182
Crane, Dr. David G., psychiatrist and attorney, Martinsville, Ind	195

FRIDAY, AUGUST 9, 1974

Keyserling, Mrs. Mary Dublin, president of the National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association; John C. Williams, Jr., cochairman of the Washington Committee for Day Care, and director of the Catholic Charities Model Cities Center; Margery Boichel, chairman of Washington Preschools, Inc.; and Miss Joyce Rawlings, vice chairman of the Parent Policy Committee, National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association, a panel	233
Panton, Gloria, center director, Capitol East Children's Center, accompanied by Shari Ostrow, teacher	262
Mathews, Reginald, Judith Mudd, Noel Kane, and Gloria Dandridge, a panel of parents from Capitol East Children's Center	269
Fleischer, Karen, past president of Wee Care; accompanied by Nancy Goodell, director, Wee Care, Inc.; and Susan Horack, day care teacher	277

STATEMENTS

Caldwell, Dr. Bettye, professor of education, University of Arkansas; director of the Center for Early Development and Learning, Little Rock, Ark	172
Capitol East Children's Center, Shari Ostrow, teacher, prepared statement	267
Champlain Valley Family Development Corporation, prepared statement	191
Crane, Dr. David G., psychiatrist and attorney, Martinsville, Ind	195
Day Care and Child Development Council of America and Day Care and Child Development Council of Oregon, prepared statement	218
Fleischer, Karen, past president of Wee Care; accompanied by Nancy Goodell, director, Wee Care, Inc.; and Susan Horack, day care teacher	277
Prepared statement	283
Goodell, Nancy, director, Wee Care, Inc., prepared statement	288
Gordon, Helen L., board member, Day Care and Child Development Council of America and Day Care and Child Development Council of Oregon, prepared statement	218

Page
Horak, Susan M., Day Care teacher, prepared statement 289
Jewett, Patricia, president, Vermont Child Care "76" Campaign; executive director, Champlain Valley Family Development Corp., Burlington, Vt. 182
  Prepared statement 191
Kane, Mr. Noel, parent, Capitol East Children's Center, prepared statement 276
Keyserling, Mrs. Mary Dublin, president of the National Capitol Area Child Association; John C. Williams, Jr., cochairman of the Washington Committee for Day Care, and director of the Catholic Charities Model Cities Center; Margery Boichel, chairman of Washington Preschool, Inc.; and Miss Joyce Rawlings, vice chairman of the Parent Policy Committee, National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association, a panel 233
Klein, Ann, Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, prepared statement 225
  Addendum to prepared statement 229
Mathews, Reginald, Judith Mudd, Noel Kane, and Gloria Dandridge, a panel of parents from Capitol East Children's Center 269
Mudd, Ms. Judith, parent, Capitol East Children's Center, prepared statement 274
New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Ann Klein, Commissioner, prepared statement 225
Ostrow, Shari, teacher, Capitol East Children's Center, prepared statement 267
Panton, Gloria, Center Director, Capitol East Children's Center, accompanied by Shari Ostrow, teacher 262
Wee Care—A District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation, Karen Fleischer, past president, prepared statement 283
White, Dr. Sheldon H., A.B., M.A., Ph. D., professor of psychology, Harvard University 154

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles, publications, etc.:

  Curriculum Vita, May 1973, Sheldon H. White, A.B., M.A., Ph. D., professor of psychology, Harvard University 158
  Day Care and Public Schools: A Cost Comparison 259
  Financing and Delivering Child Development Services, Background Paper June 1974 303
  General Accounting Office Reports on Local Government Use of Revenue Sharing Funds for Handicapped, Children, and Elderly, excerpt from the Congressional Record, House, June 11, 1974 291
  More Women Run Families, 10 Percent of Population Lives in Female-Headed Units, by Peter Milius, staff writer, from the Washington Post, August 8, 1974 180
  Partial Statement of Needs and Services of Child Development for Puerto Ricans in New Jersey 298
  Social Implications of the Definition of Intelligence, by Sheldon H. White, Ph. D., Harvard University, paper prepared for Symposium, "Intelligence: What Is It?", presented at American Education Research Association Convention, Chicago, 1974 161

Communications to:

  Brademas, Hon. John, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, from:

    Klein, Ann, Commissioner, State of New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, September 16, 1974 224
    Keller, R. F., Acting Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C., May 30, 1974 293
  Mondale, Hon. Walter F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota, from George J. Hecht, chairman, American Parents Committee and Publisher, Parents' Magazine, New York, N.Y., August 9, 1974 221
  Pepper, Hon. Claude, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, from R. F. Keller, Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C., February 13, 1974 297

Selected tables:

  Local governments which had authorized revenue funds for the handicapped as of June 30, 1973 295

Selected tables—Continued

Page
Local governments which had authorized revenue sharing funds for programs for children, as of June 30, 1973 ---- 295
Table 1.—Percent of Students in selected districts reading below age level, by ethnicity and grade, 1972 ---- 298
Table 2.—Approximate number of public day care centers and preschool programs (full day), 1973 ---- 300
Table 3.—Enrollment of 3- and 4-year old children in New Jersey in an educational program, 1969 ---- 300
Table 5.—Estimate of 3- and 4-year old children in New Jersey families below the poverty level, 1969 ---- 301
Table 6.—Estimate of 3- and 4-year-old children in New Jersey families below 125 percent of the poverty level, 1969 ---- 301
Table 7.—School enrollment for 3- and 4-year-olds by race, selected States ---- 302

APPENDIX

Current Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Activities on Behalf of Children: A Summary Report, from Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ---- 308
Implementing Child Development Programs, Report of an August 1974 National Symposium, from the Education Commission of the States, December 1974, Report No. 58, Early Childhood Report No. 10 ---- 347

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1974

THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 1974

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY,
AND MIGRATORY LABOR OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE;
AND THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION,
OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 4232, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the House Select Committee on Education) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas and Lehman; Senators Stafford and Taft.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The joint hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, the House Select Subcommittee on Education, and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor will come to order for the purpose of conducting further hearings on the child and family services bill, which has been introduced in both bodies by a number of Representatives and Senators.

At the outset, the Chair wants to observe that, unfortunately, Senator Mondale, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, who, along with Senator Javits, is the principal sponsor of the bill under consideration in the Senate, and was going to cochair this hearing with me, is not able to be here this morning.

Senator Mondale had to make a sudden trip back to his home State of Minnesota to attend the funeral of a close friend of the family. The Senator has asked me to express his regrets to the witnesses who are with us today.

I would ask unanimous consent that a copy of the opening remarks of Senator Mondale appear at this point in the record.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

Senator MONDALE. I am very pleased today to be able to begin joint hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, which I am privileged to chair, and the House Select Subcommittee on Education, ably chaired by Representative John Brademas, on S. 3754 and H.R. 15882, the Child and Family Services Acts of 1974.

These companion bills are designed to provide financial assistance necessary to help States and localities upgrade and expand their services for families and children. They contain the fundamental principles from the child development legislation which passed the Congress in 1971, but was vetoed by President Nixon.

The need for legislation of this nature is compelling:

The infant mortality rate in our country is inexcusably high—higher than that of 13 other nations.

Each year an estimated 200,000 children are struck by handicaps which could have been prevented if they and their mothers had received early health care.

There are only about 700,000 licensed spaces available for the 6 million preschool children whose mothers are working.

Our bills authorize $1.8 billion over the next 3 years to fund a wide variety of services including day care services for preschool children, medical services for expectant and new mothers to reduce the incidence of preventable birth defects, family counseling, education, health diagnosis and treatment programs, and nutrition programs for children.

I want to emphasize that programs authorized by this legislation are totally voluntary and maximize parent control and decisionmaking. The bills contain a unique phase-in year for planning, training, and technical assistance, to assure that program funds which become available in the following years can be used as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Our bills seek to help families better meet the need for quality, family-oriented, preschool programs for millions of young children whose mothers are working, or who because of inadequate resources are denied adequate health care, nutrition, or educational opportunity.

They recognize and specifically provide that child care programs must be totally voluntary, and must build upon and strengthen the role of the family as the primary and fundamental influence on the development of the child.

They assure that parents will have the opportunity to choose among the greatest possible variety of child and family services—including prenatal care, nutrition assistance, part-day programs like Head Start, after school or full day developmental day care for children of working mothers, in-the-home tutoring, early medical screening and treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions, and classes for parents and prospective parents.

I am very hopeful that through hearings such as the ones we are holding this week, we can learn more about the needs for legislation of this kind and how best to shape this legislation. And I hope that these hearings will once again demonstrate the need for enactment of this kind of legislation at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Brademas. The Chair would also like to observe that no Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives has displayed greater and more constructive leadership in the field to which this legislation is addressed than the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator Mondale.

The Chair would also like to observe that he is aware that joint House-Senate hearings are not customary on Capitol Hill, but that such hearings have proved to be most productive in the past, particularly with respect to legislation which is also within the jurisdiction of the Select Education Subcommittee in the House. For example, the legislation authorizing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act was significantly improved by joint House-Senate hearings.

The measure we have met today to consider, H.R. 15882, the Child and Family Service Act of 1974, and its companion bill in the Senate, S. 3754, was introduced last month with impressive bipartisan sponsorship.

In the House I was joined in introducing this bill by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. Mink, the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. Hansen, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. Heckler, as principal co-sponsors. In the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator Javits, as I observed earlier, joined Senator Mondale as the principal sponsors.

I might just observe at the outset, to set the stage for these hearings, that the Child and Family Services Act of 1974 is aimed at increasing and improving the day care, preschool education, health, nutrition, and other services available to American families for their children. I shall not here set forth the need for legislation in these areas, but, rather, observe that the bills that have been introduced contain provisions that are not engraved in stone.

All the co-sponsors, I am sure, are open to comments, suggestions, and proposals for amending and improving the bill as introduced. In particular, we shall want to look at the role of State and local governments in the development of child and family services in this country, the advisability of fee schedules for such services, the appropriate role for profitmaking institutions in this field, and the means by which we can assure effective parent participation in the delivery of such services.

This is not to suggest that there are not other areas of equal importance to which we shall want to address ourselves.

At this time I would like to insert in the record the text of the bills referred to.

[The text of S. 3754, the introductory statements and section-by-section analyses; together with the House companion bill H.R. 15882 follow:]

4

93d CONGRESS
2d Session

S. 3754

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

July 11, 1974

Mr. Mondale (for himself, Mr. Javits, Mr. Abourezk, Mr. Clark, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Case, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metzenbaum, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Stevenson, and Mr. Williams) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

---

A BILL

To provide for services to children and their families, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child and Family Services Act of 1974".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children;

II

(2) child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services, with a view toward offering families the options they believe are most appropriate for their particular needs;

(3) although there have been increased services for children of working mothers and single parents and although Headstart and similar programs have provided supplemental educational and other services for children, such services have not been made available to families to the extent that parents consider necessary, there are many other children whose parents are working full or part time without adequate arrangements for their children, and there are many children whose families lack sufficient resources who do not receive adequate health, nutritional, educational and other services;

(4) it is essential that the planning and operation of such programs be undertaken as a partnership of parents, community, private agencies and State and local government with appropriate supportive assistance from the Federal Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those preschool children and families with the greatest economic or human needs, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decisionmaking at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served and other individuals and organizations in the community interested in child and family service (making the best possible use of public and private resources), through a partnership of parents, State and local government and the Federal Government, building upon the experience and success of Headstart and other existing programs.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of providing training, technical assistance, planning, and such other activities as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to plan for the implementation of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, to be allocated as prescribed in section 103.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, except that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for either fiscal year, unless funds appropriated to carry out the Project

Headstart program described in section 222 (a) (1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for such years, or for any successor program are at least equal to the greater of (1) the amount appropriated to carry out such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, or (2) the amount appropriated to carry out such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Any such amounts appropriated for a fiscal year which are not obligated at the end of such fiscal year shall remain available for obligation until expended.

FORWARD FUNDING

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this Act such funding for grants, contracts, or other payments under this Act is authorized to be included in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which it shall be available for obligation.

(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

TITLE I—CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES; SPECIAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary shall take all necessary action to coordinate child and family service programs under his jurisdiction. To this end, he shall establish and maintain within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Child and Family Services administered by a Director appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, which office shall assume the responsibilities of the Office of Child Development and shall be the principal agency of the Department for the administration of this Act.

(b) A Child and Family Services Coordinating Council, consisting of the Director of the Office of Child and Family Services established under subsection (a) (who shall serve as chairperson), and representatives from the Federal agencies administering the Social Security Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and from the National Institute of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and other appropriate agencies, shall meet on a regular basis, as they may deem necessary, in order to assure coordination of child and family service activities under their respective jurisdictions so as to assure—

(1) maximum use of available resources through the prevention of duplication of activities;

(2) a division of labor, insofar as is compatible with the purposes of each of the agencies or authorities specified in this paragraph, to assure maximum progress toward the achievement of the purposes of this Act;

(3) the establishment and maintenance of procedures to insure that each office or agency of the Federal Government conducting child and family services and related activities is aware of the administrative actions of other offices or agencies with respect to the provision of financial assistance to eligible applicants; and

(4) recommendation of priorities for federally funded research and development activities related to the purposes of this Act.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Office of Child and Family Services, shall provide financial assistance for carrying out child and family service programs for children and their families under this title to prime sponsors (including educational agencies) and to other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations pursuant to applications and plans approved in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds available for this title may be used (in accordance with approved applications and plans) for the following services and activities:

(1) planning and developing child and family service programs;

(2) establishing, maintaining, and operating child and family service programs, which may include—

(A) part-day or full-day child care programs, in the child's own home, in group homes, or in other child care facilities, which provide the educational, health, nutritional, and social services directed toward enabling children participating in the program to attain their maximum potential;

(B) other health, social, recreational, and educational programs designed to meet the special needs of children and families including before- and after-school and summer programs;

(C) family services, including in-home and in-school services, and education and consultation for parents, other family members functioning in the capacity of parents, youth, and prospective and expectant parents who request assistance in meeting the needs of their children;

(D) social services including information, consultation and referral to families that request such services to help them determine the appropriateness of child and family services and the possibility of alternative plans;

(E) (i) prenatal and other medical care, including services to expectant mothers who cannot afford such services, designed to help reduce malnutrition, infant and maternal mortality, and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions, and (ii) postpartum and other medical services to recent mothers;

(F) programs designed (i) to meet the special needs of ethnic groups, including minority groups, Indian, migrant children, and children from families with special language needs, and (ii) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural backgrounds of ethnic groups including minority groups which belong to their communities and the role of members of such groups in the history and cultural development of the nation and the region in which they reside;

(G) food and nutritional services;

(H) diagnosis, identification, and treatment of visual, hearing, speech, medical, dental, nutritional, and other physical, mental, psychological and emotional barriers to full participation in child and family service programs;

(I) special activities designed to identify and ameliorate identified physical, mental, and emotional handicaps and special learning disabilities as an incorporated part of programs conducted under this title;

(J) programs designed to extend child and family service gains (paricularly parent participation) into kindergarten and early primary grades, in cooperation with local educational agencies;

(K) other such services and activities as the Secretary deems appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act;

(3) rental, lease or lease-purchase, mortgage amortization payments, remodeling, renovation, alteration, acquisition and maintenance of necessary equipment and supplies, and to the extent authorized in section 110, construction or acquisition of facilities, including mobile facilities;

(4) preservice and inservice education and train-

ing for professional and paraprofessional personnel, including parents and volunteers, especially education and training for career development and advancement;

(5) staff and other administrative expenses of child and family service councils established and operated in accordance with section 105, and of project policy committees established and operated in accordance with section 107; and

(6) dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served to assure that parents are well informed of child and family service programs available to them and may participate in such programs.

(c) Assistance under this title shall be made only for a program which

(1) provides for establishing and maintaining a parent policy committee to be composed of parents of children served by such program, which shall directly participate in the development and operation of such program (as described in section 107),

(2) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information to assure that parents of children served by such program are fully informed of program activities, and

(3) provides for regular consultation with the parents of each child regarding their child or children's

development, with ample opportunity for such parents to observe and participate in their children's activities.

SEC. 103. (a) (1) From the amounts available for planning and carrying out child and family service programs under this title the Secretary shall reserve the following:

(A) not less than 10 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, which shall be made available for the purposes of section 102 (b) (2) (I) of this title (relating to special activities for handicapped children.).

(B) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out this title as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children of migrant agricultural workers bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children of migrant agricultural workers on an equitable basis;

(C) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out this title as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children in Indian tribal organizations bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children in Indian tribal organizations on an equitable basis;

(D) not more than 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, which shall be made available under section 104(e)(2) of this title (relating to model programs);

(E) not less than 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, for the purposes of section 203 of this Act (relating to monitoring and enforcement of standards).

(2) The Secretary shall allocate the remainder of the amounts available for this title (except for funds made available under section 3(c) of this Act), among the States, and within the States among local areas, so as to provide, to the extent practicable, for the geographical distribution of such remainder in such a manner that—

(A) 50 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of economically disadvantaged children in each State and local area, respectively;

(B) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children through age five in each State and local area, respectively; and

(C) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children of working mothers and single parents in each State and local area, respectively.

For the purposes of clauses (A), (B), and (C) of this paragraph, there shall be excluded those children who are counted under clauses (B) and (C) of subsection (a) (1) of this section.

(b) Not more than 5 per centum of the total funds apportioned for use within a State pursuant to subsection (a) (2) may be made available for grants to the State to carry out the provisions of section 108 of this title.

(c) Any portion of any apportionment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Secretary determines after notice to the States and local areas involved will not be required, for the period for which such apportionment is available, for carrying out programs under this title shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Secretary shall fix, to other States or local areas on an equitable basis, taking into account the original apportionments to the States and local areas, Any amount reapportioned to a State or local area under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its apportionment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d) In determining the numbers of children for purposes of allocating and apportioning funds under this section, the Secretary shall use the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(e) As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations and apportionments required by this section.

STATE AND LOCAL PRIME SPONSORS

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this section, a State, locality, or combination of localities meeting the requirements of this part may be designated by the Secretary as a prime sponsor for the purpose of entering into arrangements to carry out programs under this title, upon the approval by the Secretary of an application for prime sponsorship which—

(1) describes the prime sponsorship area to be served;

(2) demonstrates the applicant's capability of administering a child and family service program meeting the requirements of this title, including the coordination of delivery of services within the prime sponsorship

area of other public agencies operating programs relating to child care necessary for efficient delivery of services under this Act;

(3) provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the non-Federal share requirements of the Act will be met;

(4) sets forth satisfactory provisions for establishing and maintaining a Child and Family Service Council which meets the requirements of section 104;

(5) provides that the prime sponsor shall be responsible for developing and preparing for each fiscal year a plan in accordance with section 106 and any modification thereof and for selecting or establishing an agency or agencies to administer and coordinate child and family service programs in the prime sponsorship area;

(6) sets forth arrangements under which the Child and Family Service Council will be responsible for approving child and family service plans, basic goals, policies, procedures, overall budget policies and project funding, and the selection or establishment and annual renewal of any agency or agencies under paragraph (5) of this section and will be responsible for annual and ongoing evaluation of child and family service programs conducted in the prime sponsorship area according to criteria established by the Secretary;

(7) provides assurances that staff and other administrative expenses for the Child and Family Service Councils and Local Program Councils and Project Policy Committees will not exceed 5 per centum of the total cost of child and family service programs administered by the prime sponsors unless such per centum limitation is increased to give special consideration to initial cost in the first operational year, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe;

(b) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship application submitted by a locality which is a (1) city, (2) county, or (3) other unit of general local government, or by a combination of such localities, if he determines that the application so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive and effective child and family service programs in the area of such locality. In the event that the area under the jurisdiction of a unit of general local government described in clause (1), (2), or (3) of the preceding sentence includes any common geographical area with that covered by another such unit of general local government, the Secretary shall designate to serve such area the unit of general local government which he determines has the capability of more effectively carrying out the purposes of this part with respect to such area and which has submitted an application which meets the requirements of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care and family service programs in such area.

(c) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a State, except for areas with respect to when local prime sponsors are or will be otherwise designated pursuant to this section, if he determines that the plan so submitted meets the requirements of this section and sets forth adequate arrangements for serving all geographical areas under its jurisdiction, and that the plan:

(1) meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out child and family services programs in each such area;

(2) divides those areas within the State for which no prime sponsor has been designated under subsection (c) of this section into local service areas, with due consideration in making such decisions being given to compactness, contiguity, and community of interest;

(3) provides:

(A) for establishing and maintaining with respect to each local service area a local program council composed so that (i) not less than half of the members who shall be chosen initially by parents who are recipients of federally assisted day care services, with equitable and appropriate consideration to parents selected by the parent members of Headstart policy committees where they exist, and at the earliest practicable time by the parent members of project policy committees, and (ii) the remainder shall be public members broadly representative of the general public, appointed by the chief executive officers or the governing bodies, as appropriate, of the units of general local government within the local program area;

(B) that the comprehensive child care and family service plan to be submitted by the State which affects each such area is developed and prepared with the full participation and approval of the appropriate local program council; and

(C) that contracts for the operation of programs through public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations shall be entered into only if previously approved by the local program council for the appropriate local service area; and

(4) contains assurances that any local program council may appeal directly to the Secretary whenever such council alleges that with respect to its portion of

the child and family service plan the State has failed to comply with the provisions of such plan or the provisions of the Act.

(e) In addition to prime sponsors designated under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Secretary may fund directly:

(1) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation if he determines that such Indian tribe has the capacity to carry out child and family service programs in the area to be served;

(2) a public or private nonprofit agency, including but not limited to an educational agency or institution, a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, employer organization, labor union, or employee or labor-management organization, which submits a proposal:

(i) to provide child care and family services in an area possessing a commonality of interest where no prime sponsor has been designated, or where the prime sponsor is found not to be satisfactorily implementing child and family service programs;

(ii) to provide child and family service programs on a year-round basis to children of migrant agricultural workers and their families; or

(iii) to carry out model programs especially designed to be responsive to the needs of economically disadvantaged, minority group, or bilingual children and their families.

(f) When any prime sponsor is maintaining a pattern or practice of discrimination against minority group children or economically disadvantaged children, the Secretary shall designate for prime sponsorship an alternative unit of government of public or private agency or organization in the area which will equitably serve minority group children and economically disadvantaged children.

(g) The Governor shall be given not less than thirty nor more than sixty days to review applications for prime sponsorship designation submitted by any applicant within the State other than the State, to offer recommendations to the applicant, and to submit comments to the Secretary.

(h) A prime sponsorship application submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior designation of a prime sponsor may be withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided (1) written notice of intention to disapprove such application, including a statement of the reasons therefor, (2) a reasonable time in which to submit corrective amendments to such application or undertake other necessary corrective action, and (3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

(i) (1) If any party is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action under subsection (h) with respect to the disapproval of its application submitted under this section or the withdrawal of its prime sponsorship designation, such party may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such party is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE COUNCILS

SEC. 105. (a) Each prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall establish and maintain a Child and Family

Service Council composed of not less than ten members as follows—

(1) not less than half the members of such Council shall be parents of children served in programs under this Act chosen in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of this section;

(2) the remaining members shall be appointed by the prime sponsor, in consultation with the parent members described in paragraph (1) to be broadly representative of the general public, including representatives of private agencies and organizations concerned with or operating programs relating to child and family services and at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child and family services;

(3) at least one-third of the total membership of the Child and Family Service Council shall be persons who are economically disadvantaged. Each Council shall select its own chairperson; and

(4) in establishing a Child Development and Family Service Council under this section, the prime sponsor shall give due consideration to the membership of child care and day care coordinating bodies then existing in the area to be served.

(b) In accordance with procedures which the Secretary shall establish pursuant to regulations, each prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall provide, with respect to the Child and Family Service Councils established and maintained by such prime sponsor, that—

(1) the parent members described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be democratically selected by parents as follows:

(A) in the case of Councils established by prime sponsors which are States, by the parent members of local program councils established under section 104 (d) (3); and

(B) in the case of Councils established by prime sponsors other than States (and by States with respect to local program councils), initially by parents who are recipients of federally assisted child care services, with equitable and appropriate consideration to parents selected by the parent members of Headstart policy committees and, at the earliest practicable time, by the parent members of project policy committees established under section 107 (b) (2);

(2) the terms of office and any other policies and procedures of an organizational nature, including nomination and election procedures, are appropriate in accordance with the purposes of this Act;

(3) such Council shall be responsible for approving child and family service plans, basic goals, policies, procedures, overall budget policies and project funding, and the selection or establishment and annual renewal of an administering agency or agencies and will be responsible for annual and ongoing evaluation of child and family service programs according to criteria established by the Secretary; and

(4) such Council shall, upon its own initiative or upon request of a project applicant or any other party in interest, conduct public hearings before acting upon applications for financial assistance submitted by project applicants under this part.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PLANS

SEC. 106. (a) Financial assistance under this title may be provided by the Secretary for fiscal year 1975 and any subsequent fiscal year to a prime sponsor designated pursuant to section 104 only pursuant to a child and family service plan which is submitted by such prime sponsor and approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Any such plan shall set forth a program for providing child and family service in the prime sponsorship area which—

(1) provides that programs or services under this

title shall be provided only for children whose parents request them;

(2) identifies child and family service needs and goals within the area and describes the purposes for which the financial assistance will be used, giving equitable consideration to the needs of children from each minority group and significant segment of the economically disadvantaged residing within the prime sponsorship area;

(3) meets the needs of children and families in the prime sponsorship area, to the extent that available funds can be reasonably expected to have an effective impact, with priority for services to children who have not attained six years of age;

(4) provides that programs receiving funds under section 3 (b) will give priority to providing services for economically disadvantaged children by reserving not less than 65 per centum of such funds for the purpose of serving economically disadvantaged children;

(5) gives priority thereafter to providing services to children of working mothers and single parents not covered under paragraph (4);

(6) provides that, to the extent feasible, each program within the prime sponsorship area shall include children from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds;

(7) (A) provides that no charge will be made with respect to any child who is economically disadvantaged, except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party; and

(B) provides, pursuant to criteria established in regulations promulgated by the Secretary as required by section 205, an appropriate and flexible fee schedule for children who are not economically disadvantaged, designed to permit enrollment or continued participation in the program as family income increases and based upon the size of the family, and its ability to pay, which shall provide for appropriately reduced charges for less than full day care, and shall provide that payment may be made in whole or in part by a third party in behalf of a family, with provision for waivers in cases of need.

(8) provides comprehensive services—

(A) to meet the special needs of minority group children and children of migrant agricultural workers with particular emphasis on the needs of children from bilingual families for the development of skills in English and in the other language spoken in the home, and

(B) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural background of minority groups within the prime sponsorship area;

(9) provides for direct parent participation in the conduct, overall direction, and evaluation of programs;

(10) provides that, insofar as possible, unemployed or low-income persons residing in communities being served by such projects will be employed therein, including in-home and part-time employment and opportunities for training and career development, provided that no person will be denied employment in any program solely on the grounds that such person fails to meet State or local teacher certification standards;

(11) includes a career development plan for paraprofessional and professional training, education, and advancement on a career ladder;

(12) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and other interested persons in the community are fully informed of the activities of the prime sponsor, Child and Family Service Council, project applicants, and project policy committees;

(13) sets forth provisions describing any arrangements for the delegation, under the supervision of the Child and Family Service Council, to public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, of responsibilities for the delivery of programs, services, and activities for

which financial assistance is provided under this Act or for planning or evaluation services to be made available with respect to programs under this Act;

(14) provides procedures for the approval of project applications submitted in accordance with section 107, including procedures for priority consideration of applications submitted by public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations with ongoing child development programs;

(15) provides, in the case of a prime sponsor located within or adjacent to a metropolitan area, for coordination with other prime sponsors located within such metropolitan area, and arrangements for cooperative funding where appropriate, and particularly for such coordination where appropriate to meet the needs of children of parents working or participating in training or otherwise occupied during the day within a prime sponsorship area other than that in which they reside;

(16) provides for coordination of other child care and related programs (including those relating to manpower training and employment) within the prime sponsorship area with the programs assisted under this Act, including procedures and mechanisms to provide continuity between programs for preschool and elementary school children;

(17) provides for such monitoring and evaluation procedures including licensing, inspection, and enforcement activities as may be necessary to assure that programs in the prime sponsorship area funded under this Act meet the applicable Federal standards as prescribed in section 201 of this Act;

(18) provides, to the extent practicable, for the use of financial assistance and services available from State and local government, Federal sources other than those provided in this Act, and private charitable sources with respect to activities and services under the plan; and

(19) provides for such fiscal control and funding accounting procedures as the Secretary may prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the prime sponsor.

(c) No child and family service plan or modification thereof submitted by a prime sponsor under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless he determines, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe, that—

(1) the educational agency for the area to be served and other appropriate educational and training agencies and institutions have had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(2) each community action agency or single-purpose Headstart agency in the area to be served responsible for the administration of programs under this part or under section 222 (a) (1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(3) in the case of a plan submitted by a prime sponsor other than the State, the Governor of that State, or the State Child and Family Service Council has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary.

(d) A comprehensive child and family service plan submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior approval withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided—

(1) written notice of intention to disapprove such plan, including a statement of the reasons therefor,

(2) a reasonable time to submit corrective amendments to such plan or undertake other necessary corrective action, and

(3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

PROJECT APPLICATIONS

SEC. 107. (a) Funds may be provided by the prime sponsor for carrying out any program under such prime sponsor's comprehensive child and family service plan only to a qualified public or private agency or organization, including but not limited to an educational agency or institution, a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, organization interested in child care, employer or business organization, labor union, or employee or labor management organization.

(b) Financial assistance under this title may be provided to a project applicant for any fiscal year only pursuant to a project application which is submitted to the Child and Family Service Council by a public or private agency and which—

(1) describes the project, identifies the children and families it is designed to serve, and provides for the necessary such comprehensive services.

(2) provides for establishing and maintaining a parent policy committee composed of not less than ten members as follows—

(A) not less than half of the members of each such committee shall be parents of children served by such project, democratically selected by parents of children served by the project, and

(B) the remaining members of each such committee shall consist of (i) persons who are representative of the community and who are approved by the parent members, and (ii) at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child care, child health, child welfare, or other child care services, except that the Secretary may waive the requirement of this clause where he determines, in accordance with regulations that such persons are not available to the area to be served;

(3) provides for direct participation of such parent policy committee in the development and preparation of project applications under this title;

(4) assures that the parent policy committee shall have responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions, and procedures for the project applicant, and for planning, overall conduct, personnel, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and direction and evaluation of projects, including approval of the project

director and any project applications and modifications thereof;

(5) makes adequate provision for training and other administrative expenses of such parent policy committee (including necessary expenses to enable low-income members to participate in committee meetings);

(6) assures that services shall be provided without charge to any child who is economically disadvantaged except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party, and that charges will be made to any child who is not economically disadvantaged according to the fee schedule established pursuant to section 106 (b) (7) (B);

(7) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and interested persons are fully informed of project activities;

(8) provides opportunities for the direct participation of parents, older siblings, and other family members in the daily activities of the programs in which their children are enrolled;

(9) assures, to the extent practicable, employment of paraprofessional aides and use of volunteers, especially parents, older children, students, older persons, and

persons preparing for careers in child development and family service programs;

(10) assures that children will in no case be excluded from the programs operated pursuant to this title because of their participation in nonpublic preschool or school programs or because of the intention of their parents to enroll them in nonpublic schools when they attain school age;

(11) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the prime sponsor shall prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds.

(c) A project application may be approved by a prime sponsor upon its determination that such application meets the requirements of this section and that the programs provided for therein will otherwise further the objectives and satisfy the appropriate provisions of the prime sponsor's comprehensive child and family service plan as approved pursuant to section 106.

(d) A project application from a public or private agency seeking funds under section 104(d) shall be submitted directly to the Secretary, and may be approved by the Secretary upon his determination that it meets the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

(e) A prime sponsor may disapprove a project application only if it provides to the project applicant a written statement of the reasons therefor. Such project applicant may submit an appeal to the Secretary requesting the direct approval of such application or modification thereof. Any such appeal shall include such comments, including the project applicant's response to the prime sponsor's statement of reasons for disapproval, as the project applicant may deem appropriate or as the Secretary may require.

SPECIAL GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 108. (a) Upon application submitted by any State, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for use by such State for carrying out activities for the purposes of—

(1) establishing a child and family services information program, in order to improve their quality and availability and improve the accessibility of such services to parents who need them;

(2) identifying child and family service goals and needs within the State;

(3) coordinating all State child and family services, and encouraging the cooperation and participation of State agencies in providing such services, including health, family planning, mental health, education, nutrition, and family, social and rehabilitative services where requested by appropriate prime sponsors in the develop-

ment and implementation of comprehensive child and family service plans;

(4) encouraging the full use of resources and facilities for child and family service programs within the State;

(5) developing, enforcing, and assessing State codes for licensing child and family service facilities within the State;

(6) assisting public and private agencies and organizations in the acquisition or improvement of facilities for child and family service programs;

(7) assisting in the establishment of Child and Family Service Councils and strengthening the capability of such Councils to effectively plan, supervise, coordinate, monitor, and evaluate child and family service programs;

(8) developing information useful in reviewing prime sponsorship applications under section 104 and of comprehensive child and family service plans under section 106.

(b) In order to receive funds under this section, a State shall establish a Child and Family Service Council as prescribed in section 104 (a).

(c) Funds received by the State under this section shall be in addition to any funds such State may receive under this title pursuant to an approved prime sponsorship application and comprehensive child and family service plan.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAMS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION

SEC. 109. (a) Applications for financial assistance for projects including construction or acquisition may be approved only if the prime sponsor, or the Secretary in cases of applications submitted for his approval, determines that construction or acquisition of such facilities is essential to the provision of adequate child care services, and that rental, lease, or lease-purchase, remodeling, or renovation of adequate facilities is not practicable.

(b) If any facility assisted under this title shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds unless the Secretary determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction, remodeling, renovation, or alteration projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(d) In the case of loans for construction, the Secretary shall prescribe the interest rate and the period within which such loan shall be repaid, but such interest rate shall not be less than 3 per centum per annum and the period within which such loan is to be repaid shall not be more than twenty-five years.

(e) The Federal assistance for construction, remodeling, renovation, alteration, or acquisition of facilities, may be in the form of grants or loans. Repayment of loans shall, to the extent required by the Secretary, be returned to the prime sponsor from whose financial assistance the loan was made, or used for additional loans or grants under this title. Not more than 15 per centum of the total financial assistance provided to a prime sponsor under this title shall be used for construction of facilities, with no more than 7½ per centum of such assistance usable for grants for construction. Financial assistance for construction or acquisition of facilities pursuant to this Act shall be available only to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations.

USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PROGRAMS

SEC. 110. (a) The Secretary, after consultation with other appropriate officials of the Federal Government, shall within eighteen months after enactment of this Act report to the Congress with respect to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by Federal departments, agencies, and independent authorities could be made available to public and private agencies and organizations, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child and family service programs under this title during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with his recommendations (including recommendations for changes in legislation) or proposed actions for such use.

(b) The Secretary may require, as a condition to the receipt of assistance under this title, that any prime sponsor under this title agree to conduct a review and provide the Secretary with a report as to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by such prime sponsor, or by other agencies in the prime sponsorship area, could be made available, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child and family service programs under this title during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with the prime sponsor's proposed actions for such use.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 111. (a) In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall pay from the applicable allocation or apportionment under section 103 the Federal share of the costs of programs, services, and activities, in accordance with plans or applications which have been approved as provided in this title. In making such payment to any prime sponsor, the Secretary shall include in such costs an amount for staff and other administrative expenses for the Child and Family Service Councils and for parent policy committees, consistent with limitations contained in this title.

(b) The Secretary shall pay from funds appropriated under section 3(a) for fiscal year 1975 an amount equal to 100 per centum of the cost of planning, training, and technical assistance.

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, the Secretary shall pay from funds appropriated under section 3(b) for fiscal year 1976 an amount not in excess of 90 per centum and from funds

appropriated under section 3 (b) for fiscal year 1977 and subsequent years an amount not to exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out programs, services, and activities under this title. The Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, approve assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines that such action is required to provide adequately for the child and family service needs of economically disadvantaged children.

(2) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child and family service programs for children of migrant agricultural workers under this title.

(3) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child and family service programs for children in Indian tribal organizations under this title.

(c) The non-Federal share of the costs of programs assisted under this title may be provided through public or private funds and may be in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities (or portions thereof that are used for program purposes), reasonably evaluated, or union or employer contributions. Fees collected for services shall not be used for the non-Federal share, but shall be used by the prime sponsor to improve and expand programs under the comprehensive child development and family service plan.

(d) If, with respect to any fiscal year, a prime sponsor or project applicant provides non-Federal contributions or any program, service, or activity exceeding its requirements, such excess may be applied toward meeting the requirements, for such contributions for the subsequent fiscal year under this title.

(e) No State or unit of general local government shall reduce its expenditures for child development or child care programs by reason of assistance under this title.

TITLE II—STANDARDS, ENFORCEMENT, AND EVALUATION

FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR CHILD CARE

SEC. 201. (a) (1) Within six months after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may, after consultation with other Federal agencies and with the approval of the committee established pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child care services under this or any other Federal Act, to be known as the Federal Standards for Child Care. If the Secretary disapproves the committee's recommendations, he shall state the reasons therefor.

(2) Such standards shall replace but shall be consistent

with the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements as approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor on September 23, 1968. The 1968 requirements will continue to apply to all applicable programs until program standards authorized by subsection (a) are in effect.

(3) Not less than sixty days prior to implementation of program standards pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary shall submit such proposed program standards to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. Upon majority vote of either Committee within such sixty days disapproving such proposed program standards, such standards shall not take effect.

(b) The Secretary shall establish policies and procedures, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, to assure that all programs and projects assisted under this Act address, on a continuing basis, the individual needs of and the appropriateness of child and family service for very young children served—

(1) any program or project providing care outside the home for very young children shall be reviewed and evaluated periodically and frequently by the Secretary,

to insure that it meets the highest standards of quality; and the Secretary may reserve such funds as he deems necessary from funds available under this Act for the purpose of evaluation, by appropriate persons, of programs under this Act in order to insure compliance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(2) no program or project described in clause (1) of this subsection shall be approved for assistance under this Act unless it is specifically authorized and approved by the Secretary.

(c) (1) Upon determination that a prime sponsor or project is in violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall give immediate public notice of such determination to such prime sponsor or project and, if such violation or violations have not been corrected, shall commence action within ninety days of such determination to withhold funds under section 204.

(2) Upon determination that a project is in violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the prime sponsor shall give immediate notice of such determination to such project and, if such violation or violations have not been corrected, shall commence action within ninety days of such determination to withhold funds under section 204.

(d) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after enactment of this Act, appoint a Special Committee on Federal

Standards for Child Care, which shall include parents of children enrolled in Headstart and child care programs, representatives of public and private agencies and organizations administering such programs, specialists, and other public and private providers of child and family services, individuals engaged in licensing activities, and others interested in services for children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children participating in programs conducted under title I of this Act and section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and title IV–A of the Social Security Act, or other public programs providing child and family services. Such committee shall participate in the development of Federal Standards for Child Care and modifications thereof as provided in subsection (a).

(e) In no event shall any prime sponsor or program or project receiving assistance under this Act reduce the quality of services provided under this Act below the standards established in this section.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM CODE FOR FACILITIES

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, appoint a special committee to develop a uniform minimum code for facilities, to be used in licensing child and family services facilities. Such standards shall deal principally with these matters essential to the health, safety, and physical comfort of the children and the relationship of such matters to the Federal Standards for child care developed under section 201.

(b) The special committee appointed under this section shall include parents of children enrolled in comprehensive child services programs and representatives of State and local licensing agencies, public health officials, fire prevention officials, the construction industry and unions, public and private agencies or organizations administering comprehensive child services programs, and national agencies or organizations interested in services for children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children enrolled in programs conducted under this title, section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and title IV of the Social Security Act.

(c) Within six months of its appointment, the special committee shall complete a proposed uniform code and shall hold public hearings on the proposed code prior to submitting its final recommendation to the Secretary for his approval.

(d) The Secretary must approve the code as a whole or secure the concurrence of the special committee to changes therein, and, upon approval, such standards shall be applicable to all facilities receiving Federal financial assistance under this Act or in which programs receiving such Federal financial assistance are operated; and the Secretary shall also distribute such standards and urge their adoption by States and local governments. The Secretary may from time to time modify the uniform code for facilities in accordance with the procedures described in subsections (a) through (d).

PROGRAM MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall provide, through the Office of Child and Family Services, for regular and periodic monitoring and programs under this Act to assure compliance with the child care standards and other requirements of this Act, and shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of sufficient trained staff in such office to accomplish the purpose of this section.

WITHHOLDING OF GRANTS

SEC. 204. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to any prime sponsor, or project applicant, finds—

(1) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the plan of any such prime sponsor approved under section 106; or

(2) that there has been a failure to comply with applicable standards pursuant to section 201; or

(3) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the application

of any such project applicant approved pursuant to section 107; or

(4) that in the operation of any plan, program, or project carried out by any such prime sponsor, or project applicant or other recipient of financial assistance under this Act there is a failure to comply substantially with any applicable provision of this Act or regulation promulgated thereunder;

the Secretary shall notify such prime sponsor, project applicant, or other recipient of his findings and that no further payments may be made to such sponsor, project applicant, or other recipient under this Act (or in the Secretary's discretion that any such prime sponsor shall not make further payments under this Act to specified project applicants affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or that the noncompliance will be promptly corrected. The Secretary may authorize the continuation of payments with respect to any project assisted under this Act which is being carried out pursuant to such plan or application and which is not involved in any noncompliance.

CRITERIA WITH RESPECT TO FEE SCHEDULES

SEC. 205. (a) Not later than one hundred and eighty days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall by regulation establish criteria for the adoption of fee schedules by prime sponsors as provided in section 106(b) (7) (B) of this Act. Such criteria shall be designed to permit enrollment or continued participation in the program as family income increases, shall be based on family size, and ability to pay, and shall provide for appropriately reduced charges for less than full-day care, and shall be appropriately adjusted for regional and urban-rural differences in the cost of living or determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(b) Not less than sixty days prior to implementation of the criteria established by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (B) of this section, the Secretary shall submit such proposed criteria to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. Upon a majority vote of either committee disapproving such proposed criteria, such criteria shall not take effect and the Secretary shall within sixty days promulgate revised criteria. Such revised criteria, and any revision to criteria established pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements of this section.

EVALUATION

SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary shall make an evaluation of Federal involvement in child and family services, which shall include—

(1) enumeration and description of all Federal activities which affect child and family service programs;

(2) analysis of expenditures of Federal funds for such activities and services;

(3) determination of the effectiveness of such activities and services;

(4) the extent to which preschool, minority group, and economically disadvantaged children and their parents have participated in programs under this Act; and

(5) such recommendations to Congress as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

(b) The results of the evaluation required by subsection (a) of this section shall be reported to Congress not later than two years after enactment of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall establish such procedures as may be necessary to conduct an annual evaluation of Federal involvement in child and family services programs, and shall report the results to each such evaluation to Congress.

(d) Prime sponsors and project applicants assisted under this Act and departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall, upon request by the Secretary or the Comptroller General of the United States make available, consistent with other provisions of law, such information as the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of making the evaluation required under subsection (c) of this section, or the Comptroller General determines is necessary for an independent evaluation.

(e) The Secretary may enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) The Secretary shall reserve for the purposes of this section not less than 1 per centum, but not more than 2 per centum, of the amounts available under section 3 (b) of this Act for any fiscal year.

TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program of research and demonstration projects, which shall include but not be limited to—

(1) research to develop techniques to measure and evaluate child and family services, and to develop standards to evaluate professional and paraprofessional child and family service personnel;

(2) research to test preschool programs emphasizing reading and reading readiness;

(3) preventive medicine and techniques and technology, including multiphasic screening and testing, to improve the early diagnosis and treatment of diseases and learning disabilities of preschool children;

(4) research to test alternative methods of providing child and family service;

(5) evaluation of research findings and the develop-

ment of these findings and the effective application thereof;

(6) dissemination and application of research and development efforts and demonstration projects to child and family service and related programs and early childhood education, using regional demonstration centers and advisory services where feasible;

(7) production of informational systems and other resources necessary to support the activities authorized by this Act; and

(8) a study of the need on a nationwide basis for child and family services programs and of the resources, including personnel, which are available to meet this need.

(b) In order to carry out the program provided for in this section, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts or other arrangements with public or nonprofit private agencies (including other Government agencies), organizations, institutions, and individuals.

(c) (1) The Secretary shall coordinate, through the Office of Child and Family Services established under section 101 (a), all child and family services research, training, and development efforts conducted within the Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare and, to the extent feasible, by other agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(2) Funds available to any Federal department or agency for the purposes of this title shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Secretary for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and the funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Secretary through the Office of Child and Family Services established under section 101 (a), for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

(d) The Secretary shall conduct special demonstration, and model programs, which demonstration, and model programs shall be subject to the fullest extent practicable to each of the requirements with respect to project applications under section 107.

(e) The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than September 1, 1975, summarizing his activities and accomplishments under this section during the preceding fiscal year and the grants, contracts, or other arrangements entered into and making such recommendations (including recommendations for legislation) as he may deem appropriate.

TITLE IV—TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TRAINING

SEC. 401. The Secertary is authorized to make payments to provide financial assistance to enable individuals employed or preparing for employment in child and family services programs assisted under this Act, including volunteers, to participate in programs of preservice or inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel, to be conducted by any agency carrying out a child and family services program, or any institution of higher education, including a community college, or by any combination thereof.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING

SEC. 402. The Secretary shall, directly or through grant or contract, make technical assistance available to prime sponsors and to project applicants participating or seeking to participate in programs assisted under this Act on a continuing basis, to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out child and family services programs.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 501. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(3) "child and family service programs" means programs on a full-day or part-day basis which provide or arrange for the provision of the educational, nutritional, health, and other services needed to provide the opportunity for children to attain their full potential, including services to other family members;

(4) "children" means individuals who have not attained the age of fifteen;

(5) "economically disadvantaged children" means any children of a family having an annual income below the lower living standard budget (adjusted for regional and metropolitan, urban, and rural differences, and family size), as determined annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at the Department of Labor;

(6) "handicapped children" includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services;

(7) "program" includes any program, service, or

activity, which is conducted full- or part-time in the home, in schools, or in child facilities;

(8) "parent" means any person who has primary day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(9) "single parent" means any person who has sole day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(10) "working mother" means any mother who needs child or family service in order to undertake or continue full- or part-time employment, training, or education outside the home;

(11) "minority group" includes, but is not limited to, persons who are Negro, American Indian, Spanish-surnamed American, Portugese, or Oriental, and, as determined by the Secretary, children who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English and who, as a result of language barriers, may need special assistance, and, for the purpose of this paragraph, "Spanish-surnamed Americans" includes, but is not limited to, persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish origin or ancestry;

(12) "bilingual" includes, but is not limited to persons who are Spanish-surnamed Americans, American Indian, Oriental, Portuguese, or others who have learned during childhood to speak the language of the minority

group of which they are members and who, as a result of language barriers, may need special assistance;

(13) "local educational agency" means any such agency as defined in section 801 (f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(14) "unit of general local government" means any political subdivision of a State having general governmental powers.

NUTRITION SERVICES

SEC. 502. In accordance with the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish procedures to assure that adequate nutrition services will be provided in child and family services programs under this Act. Such services shall make use of the special food service program for children as defined under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act of 1946 and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, to the fullest extent appropriate and consistent with the provisions of such Acts.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless the grant, contract, or agreement with respect to such program specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any program, program participant, or any applicant for participation in such program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation or beliefs.

(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act. The Secretary shall enforce the provisions of the preceding sentence in accordance with section 602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken by the Secretary to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if that person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act.

(c) The Secretary may make such grants, contracts, or agreements, establish such procedures, policies, rules, and regulations and make such payments in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including necessary adjustments in payments on account of overpayments or underpayments. Subject to the provisions of section 504, the Secretary may also withhold funds otherwise payable under this Act in order to recover any amounts expended in the current or immediately prior fiscal year in violation of any provision of this Act on any term or condition of assistance under this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program, service, or activity under this Act unless he determines that persons employed thereunder, other than persons who serve without compensation, shall be paid wages which shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of—

(1) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), if section 6(a)(1) of such Act applied to the participant and if he were not exempt under section 13 thereof;

(2) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment; or

(3) the prevailing rates of pay for persons employed in similar occupations by the same employer.

(e) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless he determines that no funds will be used for and no person will be employed under the program in the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is for use for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship.

SPECIAL PROHIBITIONS AND PROTECTIONS

SEC. 505. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law.

(b) The Secretary is directed to establish appropriate procedures to insure that no child shall be the subject of any research or experimentation under this Act unless the parent or guardian of such child informed of such research or experimentation and is given an opportunity as a right to except such child therefrom.

(c) A child participating in a program assisted under this Act shall not undergo medical or psychological examination experimentation or research, immunization (except to the extent necessary to protect the public from epidemics of contagious diseases or in cases of medical emergencies where parental consent cannot be readily obtained), or treatment without the written permission of his parent or guardian based upon full understanding of the procedures and possible consequences.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

SEC. 506. Applications for designation as prime sponsors, comprehensive child development plans, project applications, and all written material pertaining thereto shall be made readily available without charge to the public by the prime sponsor, the applicant, and the Secretary.

REPEAL OR AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AUTHORITY AND COORDINATION

SEC. 507. (a) After consultation with the head of any agency of the Federal Government immediately responsible for providing Federal assistance for and family services, child care, and related programs, including title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 222 (a) (2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and titles IV and VI of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish regulations to assure the coordination of all such programs with the programs assisted under this Act.

(b) (1) Section 203 (j) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "or civil defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "civil defense, or the operation of child care facilities".

(2) Section 203 (j) (3) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out, in the first sentence, "or public health" and inserting in lieu thereof "public health, or the operation of child care facilities";

(B) by inserting after "handicapped," in clause (A) and clause (B) of the first sentence the following: "child care facilities"; and

(C) by inserting after "public health purposes" and the second sentence, the following: ", or for the operation of child care facilities,"

ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 508. In carrying out the purposes and provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to accept and use funds appropriated to carry out other provisions of Federal law if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

Introductory Statements by Messrs. Mondale, Javits, and Cranston

[Excerpts from the Congressional Record—Senate, July 11, 1974]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1974

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today I am privileged to introduce with the distinguished senior Senator from New York (Mr. Javits), and Senators Abourezk, Clark, Brooke, Case, Cranston, Hatfield, Hathaway, Hart, Hollings, Hughes, Humphrey, Kennedy, McGee, Metzenbaum, Nelson, Pell, Percy, Randolph, Ribicoff, Stafford, Stevenson, and Williams, the Child and Family Services Act of 1974.

Mr. President, a companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives today by Representative John Brademas, who chairs the House Select Subcommittee on Education and is a creative and forceful leader on this effort and many other efforts designed to improve opportunities for families and their children. Representative Brademas is joined by Representatives Orval Hansen, Patsy Mink, and Margaret Heckler as major sponsors of the companion bills and by over 50 other cosponsors.

Our bill is designed to provide financial assistance to help States and localities upgrade the quality and expand their services for children and families. This measure incorporates the fundamental principles and elements contained in both the child development provisions in S. 2007, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971, which passed the Congress in 1971, and was vetoed by President Nixon, and in the Comprehensive Headstart Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972 which passed the Senate by a vote of 73 to 12 on June 20, 1972.

PURPOSE

Our bill seeks to help families better meet the need for quality, family-oriented, preschool programs for millions of young children whose mothers are working, or who because of inadequate resources are denied adequate health care, nutrition, or educational opportunity.

It recognizes and specifically provides that child care programs must be totally voluntary, and must build upon and strengthen the role of the family as the primary and fundamental influence on the development of the child.

It assures that parents will have the opportunity to choose among the greatest possible variety of child and family services—including prenatal care, nutrition assistance, part-day programs like Head Start, after school or full day developmental day care for children of working mothers, in-the-home tutoring, early medical screening and treatment to detect and remedy handicapping conditions, and classes for parents and prospective parents.

2

THE NEED

Mr. President, the need for adequate care for the millions of children whose parents are working has increased drastically in recent decades, and continues to grow. Hearings I conducted recently in my Subcommittee of Children and Youth concerning trends and pressures affecting the American families have provided a real understanding of the needs. Permit me to cite just two findings.

First, there has been a tremendous increase in the numbers of mothers who are working. Consider the facts:

In 1971, 43 percent of the Nation's mothers worked outside the home, compared to only 18 percent in 1948.

One out of every three mothers with preschool children is working today, compared to one out of eight in 1948.

Thirteen percent of all children—some 8.3 million—are living in single parent families, and 65 percent of these parents are working.

Yet, there are only about 700,000 spaces in licensed day care centers to serve the 6 million preschool children whose mothers work.

Some of these children are receiving adequate care while their mothers work, but many are not. Many are left in purely custodial and unlicensed day care centers, and many others are left alone to look after themselves, because that is all their parents can afford. For example, it is estimated that 10 percent of the elementary school children, aged 6 to 11, whose mothers work are left alone after school to look after themselves.

In addition, Mr. President, the need for adequate child care has increased since my previous bill was vetoed. Between 1970 and 1973, for example, there has been an increase of 650,000 in the number of children whose mothers are working. And since that veto, the average family's real spendable earnings has fallen by 3.4 percent—increasing the difficulties of working families who do not have enough money to pay for the decent child care they want for their children.

And although some existing Federal programs, such as title IV of the Social Security Act, help provide day care for these children, much of it is inadequate. Dr. Edward Zigler, the dedicated and talented former Director of HEW's Office of Child Development, stated that in "many instances we are paying for service that is harmful to children."

The need for improved and upgraded day care opportunities among families near but above the poverty line can hardly be overemphasized. There are 1 million children of working mothers in families with incomes between $4,000 and $7,000—incomes which are just a little too high to qualify for most federally assisted day care programs such as those under Head Start and title IV of the Social Security Act, and too low to afford quality day care in private programs. Indeed, these families living in near poverty have perhaps the greatest unmet need for quality day care.

Some people would like us to believe that the day care needs of the near-poor and working parents have been adequately met by the recently enacted liberalization of income tax deductions for child care. But the facts do not support this optimism.

In response to my inquiry concerning the tax savings under this new income tax deduction, the Treasury has provided the following information:

A family of four with an income of $5,000 which spends $500 for child care would realize no tax savings;

A family of four with a $7,000 income which spends $700 for child care would realize a savings of only $77;

A family of four with a $10,000 income which spends $1,000 for child care would realize only $190 tax savings;

A family of four with an income of $18,000 and child care expenses of $1,000 would save $250 in taxes.

Mr. President, our hearings on the American families revealed a second striking trend that has paralleled the dramatic increase of working mothers. Over the past several decades, America has experienced the virtual disappearance of the extended family. Testimony showed that at the turn of the century, for example, 50 percent of the homes in Boston contained parents, their children, and at least one other adult—a grandparent, an aunt, or other relative. That figure today is about 4 percent. This is representative of the decline in extended families nationally. And this has meant a tremendous decrease in the availability of relatives to look after children when both mother and father are working.

These inadequacies in our child care system can have a lasting and detrimental effect on children. Every parent knows the importance of the first 5 years of life. We know that these beginning years are the most important for a child's growth and development. These early years are the formative years—they are the years in which permanent foundations are laid for a child's feelings of self worth, his sense of self-respect, his motivation, his initiative, and his ability to learn and achieve.

Yet, the statistics I have cited already make it clear beyond any doubt that we are not offering the support many families need; and that we have particularly neglected families and children with the greatest economic and human need.

Mr. President, today there are over 3 million preschool children whose families have incomes below the poverty level, and probably an equal number of families living in near poverty. In spite of the love and attention these children receive from their families, many are growing up without the nutrition and health care during their early years that are necessary for a child to have a real chance in American life.

These are what I call "cheated children"—children who simply do not have the access to the fundamental kinds of health, nutritional, and educational care that most Americans take for granted.

Recent findings by the Mississippi Medicaid Commission indicate the magnitude of health needs alone. The extent of undetected and untreated health problems among poor children examined by that commission are frightening. The commission found 1,301 medical abnormalities in the 1,178 children it examined, including: 305 cases of multiple cavities; 97 cases of faulty vision; 217 cases of enlarged tonsils; 57 cases of hernia; 48 cases of intestinal parasites—mostly hookworms; 53 cases of poor hearing; and 32 other medical conditions requiring immediate treatment.

Many poor children—Mexican American, Indians, Eskimos, Puerto Ricans, and members of other minority groups—grow up learning English as a second language, or not at all. They are confronted with an alien language and an alien culture when they begin school, often with very little preparation.

GROWING NATIONAL AWARENESS

Mr. President, our Nation is paying far too great a cost—in both human and economic terms—for this neglect. And there is growing public awareness of these needs. Of all the individuals and organizations which have identified child care and preschool education as a top priority in recent years—and the list is simply too long to include at this point—let me cite just two examples.

The 1970 White House Conference on Children—composed of a broad cross-section of over 2,000 delegates representing every walk of life across our Nation—identified as its No. 1 priority among children's services the provision of "comprehensive family-oriented child development programs including health services, day care, and early childhood education."

Specifically, the White House Conference said:

> We recommend that the Federal Government fund comprehensive child care programs, which will be family centered, locally controlled, and universally available, with initial priority to those whose needs are greatest. These programs should provide for active participation of family members in the development and implementation of the program. These programs—including health, early childhood education and social services—should have sufficient variety to insure that families can select the options most appropriate to their needs. A major educational program should also be provided to inform the public about the elements essential for quality in child care services, about the inadequacies of custodial care, and the nature of the importance of child care services as a supplement, not a substitute, for the family as the primary agent for the child's development as a human being.

Mr. President, the need for the legislation we are introducing today was eloquently stated by President Nixon in February of 1969 when, in a message to Congress, he stated:

> So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

Mr. President, I would like to summarize at this point the key elements and principles in the legislation we are introducing today.

First, and above all, this legislation is grounded on the belief and recognition that families are the primary and most fundamental influence on children, and that child and family services programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family. That is why our bill is designed to maximize parent control and strengthen family life. That is why the programs under this legislation are totally voluntary—available only for children whose parents request them. That is why parents whose children are served under these programs will compose at least 50 percent of the governing boards—which decide what services will be offered, which programs will be funded, and what curriculums, policies, and personnel shall be approved.

And that is why our bill provides a wide variety of services—including part-day child care such as Headstart, in-the-home services to children and their families, full-day child care, after school child care, prenatal care, medical services for new mothers to reduce the incidents of preventable birth defects, and health diagnosis and treatment programs. By a combination of these provisions—the totally voluntary nature, the parent control, and the wide variety of programs available—we are assuring that families will have the options and supports available that they find are necessary.

Second, our bill is designed to assure that any services made available are quality services. Programs funded under this act must meet the 1968 Federal interagency day care requirements, and any improvements thereto promulgated after enactment of this bill. It is not enough simply to provide mind numbing, custodial care for children while their parents work, or health and education services that are third rate, and our bill is drafted specifically to prevent that.

Third, our bill is designed to make services available to a broad range of families who need them. For that reason, services would be free for families with incomes below the lower living standard budget as determined annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. This is our Government's most realistic measure of the minimum amount a family needs to survive in this country. Currently, the lower living standard budget for an average family of four is $8,118. Under our bill services would be free to families of incomes up to that level, adjusted for family size, and a sliding fee schedule would begin at that point to permit families with incomes above that level to participate at fees they could afford. Sixty-five percent of the funds under this bill would be reserved for serving children from families with incomes up to the lower living standard budget, with up to 35 percent of the funds available to serve children with families with higher incomes.

Fourth, the authorizations in our bill are designed to provide for a 1-year phase-in for planning and training and then steady growth at amounts that could be efficiently and effectively absorbed. During the first year of the bill, we provide $150 million for planning, training, and technical assistance.

This unique planning year is designed to assure that money which becomes available in subsequent years can be used to its full effectiveness. In the second year of the bill, $200 million are authorized for continued planning and preparation, with $500 million available for upgrading and improving programs. The third and final year of this bill provides a $1 billion authorization for upgrading and improving services and programs.

Fifth, the bill provides heavy emphasis on training. Assistance is authorized to local programs for inservice-preservice training, for professional and paraprofessional personnel, especially family members and members of the community. We view this as one of the key elements in our effort to upgrade the kind of care available to children of working parents.

Sixth, the administrative or delivery system in this bill provides that programs would be administered through a system of State and local governmental "prime sponsors," if they meet the criteria and can administer programs effectively, efficiently and in a coordinated fashion. But I want to emphasize at this point that we do not have the final answer to the question of what delivery system is best. Our goal is to explore this question very deeply throughout the hearings and investigations of this bill. We want to develop a system that will insure parental involvement, local diversity to meet local needs, and appropriate State involvement to assure coordination and maximum use of sources available. We intend to invite testimony and views from representatives from Federal, State, and local governments, child and family service specialists, as well as other experts as we seek to discover the best allocation of administrative responsibility among the various levels of government.

Mr. President, let me emphasize one final point. This bill is designed to provide the substance necessary to achieve the national commitment called for 5 years ago. It is our best thinking, after 5 years of legislative investigation, and passage of several previous bills, about the way to best provide for the wide variety of programs and services that families need. But nothing in this bill is etched in stone.

We want the advice and counsel of families, and of a wide variety of individuals and organizations experienced and knowledgeable about child care and child services from all sections of the country as we begin hearings and investigations on this bill. I believe I speak for all the sponsors of this legislation, when I say that we are open, indeed anxious, to receive suggestions and recommendations about ways to strengthen and improve this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator Mondale in the introduction of the Child and Family Services Act of 1974. This bipartisan measure, cosponsored by 22 of our colleagues, including Senators Brooke, Case, Hatfield, Percy, and Stafford, would provide for quality child care and other vital family services; a similar measure is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Brademas, joined by Representatives Hansen, Mink, and Heckler.

Under our proposal, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would be authorized to fund a variety of quality child and family services assisting children and families in the Nation. Services provided under the bill would include in-the-home tutoring, education for parent-hood, prenatal services, part-day and full-day and after-school programs, food and nutrition services, and information and referral services to aid families in selecting child and family services.

The program would be administered by the Office of Child and Family Services, essentially a renaming of the current Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through a system of State and local prime sponsors as well as educational and other institutions and, in specific circumstances other public and private grantees.

Each prime sponsor would submit a comprehensive child and family services plan which would have to be approved by a representative Child and Family Services Council. Localities demonstrating capability to administer programs would do so within their jurisdiction. State governments would administer programs in other areas and have specific funds for coordination and specific statewide efforts.

The measure builds upon the child care title which was included in the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1971, which the President vetoed in December of that year, and upon the Comprehensive Head Start, Child Development and Family Services Act of 1972, jointly sponsored by Senator Mondale and myself, which passed the Senate on June 20, 1972, but as to which no action was taken by the House of Representatives.

We are introducing this measure today—and the similar bill is being introduced in the House, in order to prompt the national debate on the need for child care which the President urged in vetoing the 1971 measure.

As evidence of our desire to enter into that debate freely and with flexibility, the measure we introduce today, while designed basically to the same objective as the previous measure, differs from them in a number of important respects.

First, the bill authorizes an aggregate of $1.8 billion over a 3-year period, compared with the 1972 Senate-passed measure which authorized $2.8 billion over a 2-year period.

Second, we have not included in this measure authority for the continuation of the Head Start program. The Economic Opportunity and Community Partnership Act of 1974, which I shall introduce shortly, with Senators Kennedy, Dole, and Johnston, will extend the Headstart program for 3 fiscal years, through fiscal year 1977, with increased authorization of appropriations for that effort. As these bills are considered by the committee, the relationship between the efforts shall be addressed.

Third, we have not included a population requirement for localities to qualify as prime sponsors, the vetoed bill required a population of 5,000 and the 1972 passed bill required 25,000. We have left this matter open so as to be free to achieve in the final legislation the best allocation of responsibility among various levels of government, which will insure parental involvement, local diversity to meet local needs, and appropriate State participation to insure coordination and maximum utilization of available resources.

Mr. President, with this general background I shall now comment on various aspects of this bill which are particularly important to New York City and New York State.

First in terms of the need for this legislation, I note that in New York City alone there are over 1.9 million children under the age of 14 of which 742,000 are under age of 6. On the welfare rolls, there are over 400,000 children under the age of 14 in families receiving AFDC. In contrast, there are approximately only 42,000 licensed day care slots funded publicly.

For New York State overall—including New York City— there are approximately 4.5 million children under the age of 14, of which 1.8 million are under the age of 6; 729,553 children are in families on the

AFDC roles. Precise estimates of the number of publicly funded child care positions in the State are not available, but the number is under 70,000.

Exact allocations under this measure to the State cannot, of course, a this point in time, be determined, but as a general rule, we expect New York State to receive at least 8 percent of the total of funds available for programs in each of the 2 years of actual operation.

At a cost of approximately $2,200 for each preschool slot, this would mean that 18,182 opportunities could be funded in fiscal year 1976 and 36,364 in fiscal year 1977, from New York State's share of $500 million and $1 billion respectively.

Second, under the bill no charge would be made for services for children in families below the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard, now at $8,100 a year for a family of four. This provision is crucial to families in New York City and New York State where the costs are so high that any fees below that point would effectively make it impossible for families to participate in the program. The provisions of this bill are much more realistic in this respect than those in the vetoed measure which permitted a fee schedule to be imposed above the level of $4,320 a year for a family of four.

Third, the bill includes, as did previous measures, the requirements not only that parents participate in the programs, but that they have a leading role in the development of the programs. This would be accomplished through the requirement that each prime sponsor have a Child and Family Services Council of which one-half of the members must be parents as well as a number of other provisions. The current programs in New York City and State have these elements in practice and this aspect has been a key element in their effectiveness.

Mr. President, currently in the Nation there are only 700,000 licensed day care places for 6 million preschool children with working mothers; even beyond that, as overall fact, 43 percent of the Nation's mothers work outside the home compared with 18 percent in 1948.

It is now time that the administration face up to these economic realities and the social realities which arise therefrom as well as other sources, abandon its past reluctance to make a full national commitment to providing services for families, and work with the Congress, with this measure as the vehicle toward a proper legislative framework in which these services may be provided.

This Nation, with all of its resources, is way behind most of the other industrialized nations of the world in the provision made for children and families—a "crying" if not "fatal" gap, in terms of long-term costs to individuals and society, in our social legislation.

We seek to fill that gap through legislation which will insure, compatible with the principles of our Nation, a completely voluntary program, and in the nature of service to the family and the child with Federal, State, and local government providing only the resources and the administrative framework in which family needs may be met.

[From the Congressional Record—Senate, July 22, 1974]

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, last week, I joined with Senator Walter Mondale, chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee on

Children and Youth, Senator Jacob Javits, ranking minority member of the Labor Committee, and 21 other Senate cosponsors in introducing S. 3754, legislation of vital importance in helping to meet the Nation's child-care needs. This is urgently needed legislation, and today I would like to speak about some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, this is not the first time that the Senate has undertaken to pass comprehensive child development legislation. During the 92d Congress, S. 3617, the Comprehensive Headstart, Child Development and Family Services Act, passed the Senate but failed to gain sufficient support in the House before the adjournment of that Congress. S. 3617—which sought to provide the best possible family-strengthening comprehensive child care legislation—was the result of a bipartisan effort to shape a child development bill that would meet the objections of the President to S. 2007, legislation to extend the Economic Opportunity Act, which he had vetoed the year before.

As a member of the Senate Subcommittees on Children and Youth, and Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor, I was involved throughout the development of this legislation and believe it was a great loss to this Nation when the House failed to take action on S. 3617 before the end of the last Congress, thus allowing the bill to die.

Mr. President, efforts to meet the needs of children have also been thwarted by the persistent attempts of the Administration to reduce the scope of social services programs funded under the matching titles of the Social Security Act. In California, three child care programs are presently under such funding—the children's centers programs, the migrant day care program, and the campus child care program. In fiscal year 1974, they accounted for some 65 percent of California's social services allotment under title IV–A.

Last year, when Congress realized that social services expenditures were threatened with severe curtailment, owing to restrictive regulations proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it expressed disapproval of this administrative approach and enacted legislation which suspended implementation of the regulations. Under provisions in Public Law 93–233, the regulations in effect in January of 1973—before the new regulations were proposed by HEW—were extended an additional 12 months, through December 1974.

The Senate has also passed legislation—in H.R. 3153, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1973—which, in effect, converts the 75-percent Federal matching funds under the social services program to a social services revenue sharing program. I supported this provision when H.R. 3153 was considered on the floor, after strongly urging adoption of Senator Mondale's successful amendment to require that child care programs supported under title IV–A to meet the requirements of the interagency day care standards of 1968.

In connection with the effort to prevent emasculation of the social services program, I also was privileged to chair joint hearings last year on June 15 in San Francisco, and on June 16 in Los Angeles, of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor and the Special Subcommittee on Human Resources, on the effect of the proposed cutback in social services, along with the impact of other administration recommended budget cuts. Senator Mondale, the author of both S.

2528—the social services legislation which led to the compromise now in H.R. 3153—and S. 1220—legislation I cosponsored earlier this session which resulted in the original Finance Committee postponement of the effective date of the May 1 regulations—joined me at those hearings.

The challenge of child care needs is vital to us all. Our children are our future. They deserve the very best we can provide for their growth and development. Yet millions of children today are denied the chance to realize their potential. The magnitude of child care needs for the children of this country is staggering.

In a report on the numbers of eligible children and available licensed facilities for day care, the Small Business Reporter declared that almost half of America's mothers with children under 18 hold jobs outside their homes. In 1972, of the 12.7 million workers in the Nation's labor force, 4.4 million had 5.5 million children not yet old enough to attend school. California alone has 470,000 workers mothers responsible for nearly 1 million preschool children. During the same year, however, only about 700,000 places in licensed day care facilities were available throughout the country; and the State of California was able to offer a mere 140,000 spaces for its preschool youngsters.

National studies show that approximately half of the eligible preschoolers stay at home to be cared for by a nonworking parent, older child, or relative. Another 2 million of the country's children under 6 are left in the care of half a million substitute mothers in family day care homes.

I think it is significant that these figures are cited in a business magazine published by the Bank of America. The business community knows that there is a day care market that can fairly be anticipated to reflect a steadily growing demand for facilities. Further on in the report, the Small Business Reporter assesses the future day care demand. Among other things, it states that, despite reports of the decline in the birth rate, the number of young women is on the rise. In 1970 there were 15.5 million American women between the ages of 20 and 29, considered the prime childbearing years. According to census projections, this group may well reach 20.6 million by 1985.

And whether or not the present birth rate declines further, Mr. President, the number of preschool youngsters is expected to increase. In 1970, there were 17.2 million children under 5; in 1975—depending on birth rate fluctuations—the under-5's might total anywhere from 18.9 to 21.3 million. By 1985, the United States could well have as many as 30.2 million preschoolers.

The reporter goes on to point out the effects of changing child-raising attitudes and occupation roles. During the sixties, California's work force of women grew by more than 50 percent. Today, one-third of the State's mothers of preschool youngsters work part time or full time—some because of economic necessity, others for personal fulfillment. Statisticians predict that during the seventies, the number of employed preschool mothers, will rise by 50 percent, reaching 5 million in 1975, 5.3 million in 1980, and 6.6 million by 1985.

California's performance, although meeting less than 15 percent of the child care needs of over 1 million children, is by far the best in the country. Due particularly to Superintendent of Schools Wilson Riles' leadership, California is providing fully 20 percent of the nationwide day care spaces.

Another factor contributing to the burgeoning female work force is the rising divorce rate and the attendant number of households now headed by women. Over the last decade, marital dissolutions—often involving young women with preschool children—in California rose by 148 percent, and in 1970 the State had 296,000 such families.

We now have only about 700,000 child care "slots" in licensed facilities throughout the country. That is just 10 percent of the number of children of working mothers. The large majority of these children are cared for in their own homes or the homes of others, or they are just not cared for at all. At best, most receive only custodial care.

The bill we have introduced, S. 3754, the Child and Family Services Act of 1974, will go a long way toward rectifying this dismal situation by authorizing a variety of services for preschool children and their families, including all-day and half-day care, afterschool programs, and in-the-home tutoring and education for parenthood. Services will also include prenatal care, nutrition, diagnosis and treatment of health problems, and special activities for handicapped children.

I am especially pleased that programs for preschool children from needy homes will receive top priority and that the bill will set aside special funds for handicapped, migrant, and Indian children.

An important feature of the bill, I believe, is its recognition that the family is the primary influence on children. The bill will strengthen the role of the family by providing greater parental control over the programs in which their children take part.

I would also like to stress the fact that participation in any of the programs will be strictly on a voluntary basis and that a child could participate only upon the request of his or her parent or guardian.

Services under the bill would be carried out by local and public and private agencies, including schools, through grants and contracts from State and local government "prime sponsors." The partnership of parents, community, and State and local governments, with assistance from the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is another important feature of the new bill.

I am delighted to be joining my colleagues, Senators Mondale and Javits, and others in introducing such farsighted and responsive legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1

Title.—Child and Family Services Act of 1974.

Section 2

Statement of Findings and Purpose.—Finds that the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children, that child and family services must build upon and strengthen the role of the family; that such services must be provided on a voluntary basis to children whose parents request them with priority for preschool children with the greatest economic and human need; that there is a lack of adequate child and family services; and that there is a necessity for planning and operation of programs as partnership of parents, community, state and local governments, with appropriate federal supportive assistance.

Purpose is to establish and expand child and family service programs, build upon the experience of Headstart, give special emphasis to preschool children and families with the greatest needs, provide decision making with direct parent participation through a partnership of parents, State, local and Federal government.

Section 3

Authorization of Appropriations.—Authorizes $150 million for fiscal 1975 and $200 million for FY 1976 for training, planning, and technical assistance and $500 million in FY 1976 and $1 billion in FY 1977 for program operation. Headstart would be funded under separate authority, and its funding protected by a requirement that no operational funds could be appropriated for this new program unless and until Headstart is funded at the level it received in FY 1974 or FY 1975, whichever is higher.

Forward funding is authorized.

TITLE I—CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Section 101

Establishes Office of Child and Family Services in HEW to assume the responsibilities of the Office of Child Development and serve as principal agency for administration of this Act; and Child and Family Services Coordinating Council with representatives from various federal agencies to assure coordination of federal programs in the field.

Section 102

Financial Assistance.—Defines purposes for which federal funds can be used: (1) planning and developing programs, including pilot programs; (2) establishing, maintaining, and operating programs, including part-day or full-day child care in the home, in group homes, or in other child care facilities; other specially designed programs such as after-school programs; family services, including in-home and in-school services; information and referral services to aid families in selecting child and family services; prenatal care; programs to meet special needs of minorities, Indians, migrants and bilingual children; food and nutrition services; diagnosis of handicaps or barriers to full participation in child and family services programs; special activities for handicapped children within regular programs; programs to extend child and family service gains, including parent participation, into the elementary schools; (3) rental, renovation, acquisition or construction of facilities, including mobile facilities; (4) preservice and inservice training; (5) staff and administrative expenses of councils and committees required by the Act; and (6) dissemination of information to families.

Section 103

Allocation of Funds.—Reserves funds proportionately for migrant and Indian children, not less than 10% for services to handicapped children, and not less than 5% for monitoring and enforcement of standards.

Allocates the remainder among the states and within the states, 50% according to relative number of economically disadvantaged children, 25% according to relative number of children through age five, and 25% according to relative number of children of working mothers and single parents.

Allows use of up to 5% of a state's allocation for special state programs under Section 108.

Section 104

Prime Sponsors.—States, localities, combinations of localities or public and non-profit organizations are eligible to serve as prime sponsors.

The bills current provisions establish performance criteria for prime sponsor: demonstrated interest in and capability of running comprehensive programs, including coordination of all services for children within the prime sponsorship area; assurances of non-federal share; establishment of a Child and Family Services Council (CFSC) to administer and coordinate programs.

Public or private nonprofit organizations can serve as prime sponsors with priority on governmental units. Any locality or combination of localities which submits an application meeting the performance criteria may be designated prime sponsor if the Secretary determines it has the capacity to carry out comprehensive and effective programs. The state may be designated prime sponsor for all areas where local prime sponsors do not apply or cannot meet the performance criteria, provided that the state meets the performance criteria and divides its area of jurisdiction into local service areas with local child and family services councils which approve the relevant portions of the state's plan and contracts for operation of programs within the local service areas.

The Secretary may fund directly an Indian tribe to carry out programs on a reservation. He may also fund public or private nonprofit agencies to operate migrant programs, model programs, or programs where no prime sponsor has been designated or where a designated prime sponsor is not meeting certain needs.

Directs the Secretary to designate an alternative to any prime sponsor discriminating against minority group children or economically disadvantaged children.

Provides opportunity for Governor to comment on prime sponsorship applications and provides appeal procedure for applicants who are disapproved.

The sponsors want to particularly emphasize that as the bill is considered they intend to invite the testimony of representatives of Federal, State, and local government, as well as other experts, with respect to the best allocation of responsibility among various levels of government which will insure parental involvement, local diversity to meet local needs and appropriate State involvement to assure coordination and maximum utilization of available resources.

Section 105

Child and Family Service Councils.—Sets forth composition, method of selection, and functions of councils. Half of members must be parents, selected by parents of children served by programs under the Act. The remaining members appointed by the prime sponsor in consultation with parent members, to be broadly representative of the general public, including representatives of private agencies in the prime sponsorship area operating programs of child and family services and at least one specialist in child and family services. At least one-third of the total council to be economically disadvantaged. The council selects its own chairperson.

A state prime sponsor must establish councils at the state level and for each local service area. Parent members of the state council to be selected by parent members of local councils.

Council approves goals, policies, action and procedures of prime sponsors, including planning, personnel, budgeting, funding of projects, and monitoring and evaluation.

Section 106

Child and Family Service Plans.—Requires that prime sponsor submit plan before receiving funds. Plan must: provide services only for children whose families request them; identify needs and purposes for which funds will be used; give priority to children who have not reached six years of age; reserve 65% of the funds for economically disadvantaged children, and priority thereafter to children of single parents and working mothers; provide free services for children of families below the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard budget and establish a sliding fee schedule based on ability to pay for families above that income level; include to the extent feasible, children from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds; meet the special needs of minority group, migrant, and bilingual children; provide for direct parent participation in programs, including employment of parents and others from the community with opportunity for career advancement; establish procedures for approval of project applications with priority consideration for ongoing programs and applications submitted by public and private non-profit organizations; provide for coordination with other prime sponsors and with other child care and related programs in the area; provide for monitoring and evaluation to assure programs meet federal standards; where possible, supplement funds provided by this Act with assistance from other sources.

Requires that the Governor, all local education agencies, Headstart and community action agencies have the opportunity to comment on the plan.

Establishes appeal procedures if plans are disapproved.

Section 107

Project Applications.—Provides for grants from prime sponsor to public or private organizations to carry out programs under the prime sponsor plan pursuant to a project application approved by the CFSC.

The project applicant must establish a parent policy committee (PPC), composed of at least 10 members with 50% parents of children served by the project, at least one child care specialist, and other representatives of the community approved by the parent members. The PPC must participate in the development of project applications and must approve basic goals, policies, action and procedures of the applicant, including personnel, budgeting, location of center, and evaluation of projects.

The application must: provide for training and administrative expenses of the PPC; guarantee free services for economically disadvantaged children with fees according to the fee schedule for other children; assure direct participation of parents and other family members, including employment opportunities; provide for dissemination of information on the project to parents and the community; and provide opportunities for the participation of children, regardless of participation in nonpublic school programs.

Section 108

Special Grants to States.—Authorizes special grants to the states, on approval of Secretary, to establish a child and family services information program to assess goals and needs in state; to coordinate all state child care and related services; to develop and enforce state licensing codes for child care facilities; and to assist public and private agencies in acquiring or improving such facilities. A state must establish a Child and Family Services Council to receive a special grant.

Section 109

Additional Conditions for Programs Including Construction or Acquisition.—Allows federal funding for construction or acquisition only where no alternatives are practicable, and provides federal funding for alteration, remodeling, and renovation. Provides that no more than 15% of a prime sponsor's funds may be used for construction; that no more than half of that may be in the form of grants rather than loans, and that construction assistance will be limited to public and private non-profit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

Section 110

Use of Public Facilities for Child and Family Service Programs.—Requires that federal government and prime sponsors make available for child and family service programs facilities they own or lease, when they are not fully utilized for their usual purposes.

Section 111

Payments.—Provides 100% federal share for planning in FY 1975, 90% federal share for fiscal 1976 and 1977, 80% for subsequent fiscal years. Provides 100% federal share for programs for migrants and Indians, and allows waiver of part or all of non-federal share where necessary to meet needs of economically disadvantaged children.

Non-federal share may be in cash or in kind. Revenues generated by fees may not be used as non-federal share but must be used by prime sponsor to expand programs.

TITLE II—STANDARDS, ENFORCEMENT, AND EVALUATION

Section 201

Federal Standards for Child Care.—Authorizes a national committee on federal standards, with one-half parent participation, to establish standards for all child care services programs funded by this or any other federal act. The 1968 Interagency Day Care Requirements would continue to apply until such standards are promulgated, and any new standards must be consistent with the 1968 Requirements.

The Secretary must submit the proposed standards for approval to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor. No prime sponsor or project applicant is allowed to reduce services below these standards.

Section 202

Development of Uniform Code for Facilities.—Requires a committee to develop a uniform minimum code dealing with health and safety of children and applicable to all facilities funded by this Act.

Section 203

Program Monitoring and Enforcement.—Requires the Secretary through The Office of Child and Family Services, to establish an adequately trained staff to periodically monitor programs to assure compliance with the child care standards and other requirements of the Act.

Section 204

Withholding of Grants.—Provides procedure for withholding of funds to programs which have failed to comply with standards or requirements of the Act.

Section 205

Criteria With Respect to Fee Schedule.—Requires Secretary to establish criteria for adoption of the schedule based on family size and ability to pay with considerations for regional differences of the cost of living. The criteria must be submitted for approval by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Section 206

Evaluation.—Requires the Secretary to make annual evaluations and report to Congress on federal child family services activities.

TITLE III—RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

Section 301

Research and Demonstration.—Authorizes child and family services research and requires that the Office of Child and Family Services coordinate research by federal agencies.

TITLE IV—TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

Section 401

Preservice and Inservice Training.—Provides for training of personnel, including volunteers, employed in programs assisted under this Act.

Section 402

Technical Assistance and Planning.—Provides technical assistance to child and family services programs.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 501

Definitions.—Defines terms used in the Act.

Section 502

Nutrition Services.—Requires that procedures be established to assure adequate nutrition services in programs under the Act, including use of Section 13 (special food service programs) of the School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act.

Section 503

Special Provisions.—Anti-discrimination provisions, including separate provisions on sex discrimination. Requires that programs meet the minimum wage. Prohibits use of funds for constructing, operating, or maintaining facilities for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

Section 504

Special Prohibitions and Protections.—Provides that no child may be the subject of research or experimentation without parental approval, and that no child may be forced to undergo examination or treatment if parents object. Protects legal rights and responsibilities of parents with respect to the development of their children.

Section 505

Public Information.—Requires that all applications, plans, and written material pertaining thereto be made available to the public without charge.

Section 506

Repeal or Amendment of Existing Authority and Coordination.

Section 507

Acceptance of Funds.

93d CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 15882

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 11, 1974

Mr. Brademas (for himself, Ms. Mink, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Ms. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Bell, Mr. Dominick V. Daniels, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Ford, Mr. Esch, Mr. Clay, Ms. Chisholm, Ms. Grasso, Mr. Badillo, and Mr. Lehman) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To provide for services to children and their families, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child and Family Services Act".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children;

I—O

(2) child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services, with a view toward offering families the options they believe to be most appropriate for their particular needs;

(3) although there have been increased services for children of working mothers and single parents and although Headstart and similar programs have provided supplemental educational and other services for children, such services have not been made available to families to the extent that parents consider necessary, there are many other children whose parents are working full or part time without adequate arrangements for their children, and there are many children whose families lack sufficient resources who do not receive adequate health, nutritional, educational, and other services;

(4) it is essential that the planning and operation of programs be undertaken as a partnership of parents, community, private agencies and State and local government with appropriate supportive assistance from the Federal Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a variety of quality child and family services in order to assist parents who request such services, with priority to those pre-school children and families with the greatest needs, in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to insure decision-making at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served and other individuals and organizations in the community interested in child and family service (making the best possible use of public and private resources), through a partnership of parents, State and local government and the Federal Government, building upon the experience and success of Headstart and other existing programs.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of providing training, technical assistance, planning, and such other activities as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to plan for the implementation of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, to be allocated as prescribed in section 103.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, except that no funds are authorized to be appropriated for either fiscal year, unless funds appropriated to carry out the Project

Headstart program described in section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for such year, or for any successor program are at least equal to the greater of (1) the amount appropriated to carry out such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, or (2) the amount appropriated to carry out such program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Any such amounts appropriated for a fiscal year which are not obligated at the end of such fiscal year shall remain available for obligation until expended.

FORWARD FUNDING

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this Act, such funding for grants, contracts, or other payments under this Act is authorized to be included in the appropriations Acts for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which it shall be available for obligation.

(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

92

TITLE I—CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES; SPECIAL COORDINATING COUNCIL

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary shall take all necessary action to coordinate child and family service programs under his jurisdiction. To this end, he shall establish and maintain within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Child and Family Services administered by a Director appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, which office shall assume the responsibility of the Office of Child Development and shall be the principal agency of the Department for the administration of this Act.

(b) A Child and Family Services Coordinating Council, consisting of the Director of the Office of Child and Family Services established under subsection (a) (who shall serve as chairperson), and representatives from the Federal agencies administering the Social Security Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and from the National Institute of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and other appropriate agencies, shall meet on a regular basis, as they may deem necessary, in order to assure coordination of child and family service activities under their respective jurisdictions so as to assure—

(1) maximum use of available resources through the prevention of duplication of activities;

(2) a division of labor, insofar as is compatible with the purposes of each of the agencies or authorities specified in this paragraph, to assure maximum progress toward the achievement of the purposes of this Act;

(3) the establishment and maintenance of procedures to insure that each office or agency of the Federal Government conducting child and family services and related activities is aware of the administrative actions of other offices or agencies with respect to the provision of financial assistance to eligible applicants; and

(4) recommendation of priorities for federally funded research and development activities related to the purposes of this Act.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Office of Child and Family Services, shall provide financial assistance for carrying out child and family service programs for children and their families under this title to prime sponsors (including educational agencies) and to other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations pursuant to applications and plans approved in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Funds available for this title may be used (in accordance with approved applications and plans) for the following services and activities:

(1) planning and developing child and family service programs;

(2) establishing, maintaining, and operating child and family service programs, which may include—

(A) part-day or full-day child care programs, in the child's own home, in group homes, or in other child care facilities, which provide educational, health, nutritional, and social services directed toward enabling children participating in the program to attain their maximum potential;

(B) other health, social, recreational, and educational programs designed to meet the special needs of children and families including before- and after-school and summer programs;

school services, and education, and consultation for parents, other family members functioning in the capacity of parents, youth, and prospective and expectant parents who request assistance in meeting the needs of their children;

(D) social services including information, consultation and referral to families that request such services to help them determine the appropriateness of child and family services and the possibility of alternative plans;

(E) (i) prenatal and other medical care, including services to expectant mothers who cannot afford such services, designed to help reduce malnutrition, infant and maternal mortality, and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions, and (ii) post partum and other medical services to recent mothers;

(F) programs designed (i) to meet the special needs of ethnic groups, including minority groups, Indian, and migrant children, as well as children from families with special language needs, and (ii) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural backgrounds of ethnic groups including minority groups which belong to their communities and the role of members of such groups in the history and cultural development of the Nation and the region in which they reside;

(G) food and nutritional services;

(H) diagnosis, identification, and treatment of visual, hearing, speech, medical, dental, nutritional, and other physical, mental, psychological, and emotional barriers to full participation in child and family service programs;

(I) special activities designed to identify and ameliorate identified physical, mental, and emotional handicaps and special learning disabilities as an incorporated part of programs conducted under this title;

(J) programs designed to extend child and family service gains (particularly parent participation) into kindergarten and early primary grades, in cooperation with local educational agencies;

(K) other such services and activities as the Secretary deems appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Act;

(3) rental, lease or lease-purchase, mortgage amortization payments, remodeling, renovation, alteration, acquisition and maintenance of necessary equipment and supplies, and to the extent authorized in section 110, construction or acquisition of facilities, including mobile facilities;

(4) preservice and inservice education and training

for professional and paraprofessional personnel, including parents and volunteers, especially education and training for career development and advancement;

(5) staff and other administrative expenses of child and family service councils established and operated in accordance with section 105, and of project policy committees established and operated in accordance with section 107; and

(6) dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served to assure that parents are well informed of child and family service programs available to them and may participate in such programs.

(c) Assistance under this title shall be made only for a program which—

(1) provides for establishing and maintaining a parent policy committee, to be composed of parents of children served by such program, which shall directly participate in the development and operation of such program (as described in section 107),

(2) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information to assure that parents of children served by such program are fully informed of program activities, and

(3) provides for regular consultation with the parents of each child regarding their child or children de-

velopment, with ample opportunity for such parents to observe and participate in their child's activities.

(d) Except for the priority provided in section 107, the Secretary shall, in reviewing applications for grants or loans for programs under this title, consider the following factors—

(1) the need for a child and family services program, as demonstrated by supporting information and data;

(2) any prior planning which has been done in the area; and

(3) the ability of the applicant to best serve the needs of children in the area.

SEC. 103. (a) (1) From the amounts available for planning and carrying out child and family service programs under this title, the Secretary shall reserve the following:

(A) not less than 10 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, which shall be made available for the purposes of section 102 (d) (2) (I) of this title (relating to special activities for handicapped children).

(B) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out this title as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children of migrant agricultural workers bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United

States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children of migrant agricultural workers on an equitable basis;

(C) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out this title as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children in Indian tribal organizations bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children in Indian tribal organizations on an equitable basis;

(D) not more than 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, which shall be made available under section 104(e) (2) of this title (relating to model programs); and

(E) not less than 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out this title, for the purposes of section 203 of this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall allocate the remainder of the amounts available for this title (except for funds made available under section 3(c) of this Act) among the States, and within the States among local areas, so as to provide, to the extent practicable, for the geographical distribution of such remainder in such a manner that—

(A) 50 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of economically disadvantaged children in each State and local area, respectively;

(B) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children through age five in each State and local area, respectively; and

(C) 25 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each State among local areas, in proportion to the relative number of children of working mothers and single parents in each State and local area, respectively.

For the purposes of clauses (A), (B), and (C) of this paragraph, there shall be excluded those children who are counted under clauses (B) and (C) of subsection (a) (1) of this section.

(b) Not more than 5 per centum of the total funds apportioned for use within a State pursuant to subsection (a) (2) may be made available for grants to the State to carry out the provisions of section 108 of this title.

(c) Any portion of any apportionment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Secretary determines after notice to the States and local areas involved will not be required, for the period for which such apportionment is available, for carrying out programs under this title shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during such periods as the Secretary shall fix, to other States or local areas on an equitable basis, taking into account the original apportionments to the States and local areas. Any amount reapportioned to a State or local area under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its apportionment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d) In determining the numbers of children for purposes of allocating and apportioning funds under this section, the Secretary shall use the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(e) As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations and apportionments required by this section.

STATE AND LOCAL PRIME SPONSORS

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this section, a State, locality, or combination of localities meeting the requirements of this part may be designated by the Secretary as a prime sponsor for the purpose of entering into arrangements to carry out programs under this title, upon the approval by the Secretary of an application for prime sponsorship which—

(1) describes the prime sponsorship area to be served;

(2) demonstrates the applicant's capability of administering a child and family service program meeting the requirements of this title, including the coordination of delivery of services within the prime sponsorship area of other public agencies operating programs relating to child care necessary for efficient delivery of services under this Act;

(3) provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the non-Federal share requirements of the Act will be met;

(4) sets forth satisfactory provisions for establishing and maintaining a Child and Family Service Council which meets the requirements of section 104;

(5) provides that the prime sponsor shall be responsible for developing and preparing for each fiscal year a plan in accordance with section 106 and any modification thereof and for selecting or establishing an agency or agencies to administer and coordinate child and family service programs in the prime sponsorship area;

(6) sets forth arrangements under which the Child and Family Service Council will be responsible for approving child and family service plans, basic goals, policies, procedures, overall budget policies and project

funding, and the selection or establishment and annual renewal of any agency or agencies under paragraph (5) of this section and will be responsible for annual and ongoing evaluation of child and family service programs conducted in the prime sponsorship area according to criteria established by the Secretary;

(7) provides assurances that staff and other administrative expenses for the Child and Family Service Policy Committees will not exceed 5 per centum of the total cost of child and family service programs administered by the prime sponsors unless such per centum limitation is increased to give special consideration to initial cost in the first operational year, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe;

(b) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship application submitted by a locality which is a (1) city, (2) county, or (3) other unit of general local government, or by a combination of such localities, if he determines that the application so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive and effective child and family service programs in the area of such locality. In the event that the area under the jurisdiction of a unit of general local government described in clause (1), (2), or (3) of the preceding sentence includes any common geographical area with that covered by another such unit of general local government, the Secretary shall designate to serve such area the unit of general local government which he determines has the capability of more effectively carrying out the purposes of this part with respect to such area and which has submitted an application which meets the requirements of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care and family service programs in such area.

(c) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a State, except for areas in which local prime sponsors have been or will be otherwise designated pursuant to this section, if he determines that the State plan so submitted meets the requirements of this section and sets forth adequate arrangements for serving all geographical areas under its jurisdiction, and that the plan—

(1) meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out child and family services programs in each such area;

(2) divides those areas within the State for which no prime sponsor has been designated under subsection (c) of this section into local service areas, with due consideration in making such decisions being given to compactness, contiguity, and community of interest;

(3) provides—

(A) for establishing and maintaining with respect to each local service area a local program council composed so that (i) not less than half of the members who shall be chosen initially by parents who are recipients of federally assisted day care services, with equitable and appropriate consideration to parents selected by the parent members of Headstart policy committees where they exist, and at the earliest practicable time by the parent members of project policy committees, and (ii) the remainder shall be public members broadly representative of the general public, appointed by the chief executive officers or the governing bodies, as appropriate, of the units of general local government within the local program area;

(B) that the comprehensive child care and family service plan to be submitted by the State which affects each such area is developed and prepared with the full participation and approval of the appropriate local program council; and

(C) that contracts for the operation of programs through public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations shall be entered into only if previously approved by the local program council for the appropriate local service area; and

(4) contains assurances that any local program council may appeal directly to the Secretary whenever such council alleges that with respect to its portion of the child and family service plan the State has failed to comply with the provisions of such plan or the provisions of the Act.

(e) In addition to prime sponsors designated under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Secretary may fund directly:

(1) an Indian tribe on a Federal or State reservation if he determines that such Indian tribe has the capacity to carry out child and family service programs in the area to be served;

(2) a public or private nonprofit agency, including but not limited to an educational agency or institution, a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, employer organization, labor union, or employee or labor-management organization, which submits a proposal:

(i) to provide child and family services in an area possessing a commonality of interest where no prime sponsor has been designated, or where the prime sponsor is found not to be satisfactorily implementing child and family service programs;

(ii) to provide child and family service programs on a year-round basis to children of migrant agricultural workers and their families; or

(iii) to carry out model programs especially designed to be responsive to the needs of economically disadvantaged, minority group, or bilingual children and their families.

(f) When any prime sponsor is maintaining a pattern or practice of discrimination against minority group children or economically disadvantaged children, the Secretary shall designate for prime sponsorship an alternative unit of government of public or private agency or organization in the area which will equitably serve minority group children and economically disadvantaged children.

(g) The Governor shall be given not less than thirty nor more than sixty days to review applications for prime sponsorship designation submitted by any applicant within the State other than the State, to offer recommendations to the applicant, and to submit comments to the Secretary.

(h) A prime sponsorship application submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior designation of a prime sponsor may be withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided (1) written notice of intention to disapprove such application, including a statement of the reasons therefor, (2) a reasonable time in which to submit corrective amendments to such application or undertake other necessary corrective action, and (3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

(i) (1) If any party is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action under subsection (h) with respect to the disapproval of its application submitted under this section or the withdrawal of its prime sponsorship designation, such party may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such party is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the

Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE COUNCILS

SEC. 105. (a) Each prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall establish and maintain a Child and Family Service Council composed of not less than ten members as follows—

(1) not less than half the members of such Council shall be parents of children served in programs under this Act chosen in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of this section;

(2) the remaining members shall be appointed by the prime sponsor, in consultation with the parent members described in paragraph (1) to be broadly representative of the general public, including representatives of private agencies and organizations concerned with or operating programs relating to child and family services and at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child and family services;

(3) at least one-third of the total membership of the Child and Family Service Council shall be persons who are economically disadvantaged. Each council shall select its own chairperson; and

(4) in establishing a Child Development and Family Service Council under this section, the prime sponsor shall give due consideration to the membership of child care and day care coordinating bodies then existing in the area to be served.

(b) In accordance with procedures which the Secretary shall establish pursuant to regulations, each prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall provide, with respect to the Child and Family Service Councils established and maintained by such prime sponsor, that—

(1) the parent members described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be democratically selected by parents as follows:

(A) in the case of councils established by prime sponsors which are States, by the parent members of local program councils established under section 104 (d) (3) ; and

(B) in the case of Councils established by prime sponsors other than States (and by States with respect to local program councils), initially by parents who are recipients of federally assisted child care services, with equitable and appropriate consideration to parents selected by the parent members of Headstart policy committees and, at the earliest practicable time, by the parent members of project policy committees established under section 107 (b) (2);

(2) the terms of office and any other policies and procedures of an organizational nature, including nomination and election procedures, are appropriate in accordance with the purposes of this Act;

(3) such Council shall be responsible for approving child and family service plans, basic goal, policies, procedures, overall budget policies and project funding, and the selection or establishment and annual renewal of an administering agency or agencies and will be responsible for annual and ongoing evaluation of child and family service programs according to criteria established by the Secretary; and

(4) such Council shall, upon its own initiative or upon request of a project applicant or any other party in interest, conduct public hearings before acting upon applications for financial assistance submitted by project applicants under this part.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PLANS

SEC. 106. (a) Financial assistance under this title may be provided by the Secretary for fiscal year 1975 and any subsequent fiscal year to a prime sponsor designated pursuant to section 104 only pursuant to a child and family service plan which is submitted by such prime sponsor and approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) Any such plan shall set forth a program for providing child and family service in the prime sponsorship area which—

(1) provides that programs or services under this title shall be provided only for children whose parents request them;

(2) identifies child and family service needs and goals within the area and describes the purposes for which the financial assistance will be used, giving equitable consideration to the needs of children from each minority group and significant segment of the economically disadvantaged residing within the prime sponsorship area;

(3) meets the needs of children and families in the prime sponsorship area, to the extent that available funds can be reasonably expected to have an effective impact, with priority for services to children who have not attained six years of age;

(4) provides that programs receiving funds under section 3(b)) will give priority to providing services for economically disadvantaged children by reserving

not less than 65 per centum of such funds for the purpose of serving economically disadvantaged children;

(5) gives priority thereafter to providing services to children of working mothers and single parents not covered under paragraph (4);

(6) provides that, to the extent feasible, each program within the prime sponsorship area shall include children from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds;

(7) provides that no charge will be made with respect to any child who is economically disadvantaged, except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party;

(8) provides comprehensive services—

(A) to meet the special needs of minority group children and children of migrant agricultural workers with particular emphasis on the needs of children from bilingual families for the development of skills in English and in the other language spoken in the home, and

(B) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural background of minority groups within the prime sponsorship area;

(9) provides for direct parent participation in the conduct, overall direction, and evaluation of programs;

(10) provides that, insofar as possible, unemployed

or low-income persons residing in communities being served by such projects will be employed therein, including in-home and part-time employment and opportunities for training and career development, provided that no person will be denied employment in any program solely on the grounds that such person fails to meet State or local teacher certification standards;

(11) includes a career development plan for paraprofessional and professional training, education, and advancement on a career ladder;

(12) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and other interested persons in the community are fully informed of the activities of the prime sponsor, Child and Family Service Council, project applicants, and project policy committees;

(13) sets forth provisions describing any arrangements for the delegation, under the supervision of the Child and Family Service Council, to public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, of responsibilities for the delivery of programs, services, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this Act or for planning or evaluation services to be made available with respect to programs under this Act;

(14) provides procedures for the approval of project applications submitted in accordance with section 107, including procedures for priority consideration of applications submitted by public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations with ongoing child development programs;

(15) provides, in the case of a prime sponsor located within or adjacent to a metropolitan area, for coordination with other prime sponsors located within such metropolitan area, and arrangements for cooperative funding where appropriate, and particularly for such coordination where appropriate to meet the needs of children of parents working or participating in training or otherwise occupied during the day within a prime sponsorship area other than that in which they reside;

(16) provides for coordination of other child care and related programs (including those relating to manpower training and employment) within the prime sponsorship area with the programs assisted under this Act, including procedures and mechanisms to provide continuity between programs for preschool and elementary school children;

(17) provides for such monitoring and evaluation procedures including licensing, inspection, and enforcement activities as may be necessary to assure that pro-

grams in the prime sponsorship area funded under this Act meet the applicable Federal standards as prescribed in section 201 of this Act; and

(18) provides for such fiscal control and funding accounting procedures as the Secretary may prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the prime sponsor; and

(19) provides, to the extent practicable, for the use of financial assistance and services available from State and local government, Federal sources other than those provided in this Act, and private charitable sources with respect to activities and services under the plan.

(c) No child and family service plan or modification thereof submitted by a prime sponsor under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless he determines, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe, that—

(1) the educational agency for the area to be served and other appropriate educational and training agencies and institutions have had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(2) each community action agency or single-purpose Headstart agency in the area to be served respon-

sible for the administration of programs under this part or under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(3) in the case of a plan submitted by a prime sponsor other than the State, the Governor of that State or the State Child and Family Service Council has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary.

(d) A comprehensive child and family service plan submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior approval withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided—

(1) written notice of intention to disapprove such plan, including a statement of the reasons therefor,

(2) a reasonable time to submit corrective amendments to such plan or undertake other necessary corrective action, and

(3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

PROJECT APPLICATIONS

SEC. 107. (a) Funds may be provided by the prime sponsor for carrying out any program under such prime sponsor's comprehensive child and family service plan only to a qualified public or private agency or organization, including but not limited to an educational agency or institution, a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, organization interested in child care, employer or business organization, labor union, or employee or labor management organization.

(b) Financial assistance under this title may be provided to a project applicant for any fiscal year only pursuant to a project application which is submitted to the Child and Family Service Council by a public or private agency and which—

(1) describes the project, identifies the children and families it is designed to serve, and provides for the necessary such comprehensive services.

(2) provides for establishing and maintaining a parent policy committee composed of not less than ten members as follows—

(A) not less than half of the members of each such committee shall be parents of children served by such project, democratically selected by parents of children served by the project, and

(B) the remaining members of each such committee shall consist of (i) persons who are representative of the community and who are approved by the parent members, and (ii) at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child care, child health, child welfare, or other child care services, except that the Secretary may waive the requirement of this clause where he determines, in accordance with regulations that such persons are not available to the area to be served;

(3) provides for direct participation of such parent policy committee in the development and preparation of project applications under this title;

(4) assures that the parent policy committee shall have responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions, and procedures for the project applicant, and for planning, overall conduct, personnel, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and direction and evaluation of projects, including approval of the project director and any project applications and modifications thereof;

(5) makes adequate provision for training and other administrative expenses of such parent policy committee (including necessary expenses to enable low-income members to participate in committee meetings);

(6) assures that services shall be provided without charge to any child who is economically disadvantaged

except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party;

(7) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and interested persons are fully informed of project activities;

(8) provides opportunities for the direct participation of parents, older siblings, and other family members in the daily activities of the programs in which their children are enrolled;

(9) assures, to the extent practicable, employment of paraprofessional aides and use of volunteers, especially parents, older children, students, older persons, and persons preparing for careers in child development and family service programs;

(10) assures that children will in no case be excluded from the programs operated pursuant to this title because of their participation in nonpublic preschool or school programs or because of the intention of their parents to enroll them in nonpublic schools when they attain school age;

(11) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the prime sponsor shall prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds.

(c) A project application may be approved by a prime sponsor upon its determination that such application meets the requirements of this section and that the programs provided for therein will otherwise further the objectives and satisfy the appropriate provisions of the prime sponsor's comprehensive child and family service plan as approved pursuant to section 106.

(d) A project application from a public or private agency seeking funds under section 104 (d) shall be submitted directly to the Secretary, and may be approved by the Secretary upon his determination that it meets the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

(e) A prime sponsor may disapprove a project application only if it provides to the project applicant a written statement of the reasons therefor. Such project applicant may submit an appeal to the Secretary requesting the direct approval of such application or modification thereof. Any such appeal shall include such comments, including the project applicant's response to the prime sponsor's statement of reasons for disapproval, as the project applicant may deem appropriate or as the Secretary may require.

SPECIAL GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 108. (a) Upon application submitted by any State, the Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for use by such State for carrying out activities for the purposes of—

(1) establishing a child and family services information program, in order to improve their quality and availability, and improve the accessibility of such services to parents who need them;

(2) identifying child and family service goals and needs within the State;

(3) coordinating all State child and family services, and encouraging the cooperation and participation of State agencies in providing such services, including health, family planning, mental health, education, nutrition, and family, social and rehabilitative services where requested by appropriate prime sponsors in the development and implementation of comprehensive child and family service plans;

(4) encouraging the full use of resources and facilities for child and family service programs within the State;

(5) developing, enforcing, and assessing State codes for licensing child and family service facilities within the State;

(6) assisting public and private agencies and organizations in the acquisition or improvement of facilities for child and family service programs;

(7) assisting in the establishment of Child and Family Service Councils and strengthening the capa-

bility of such Councils to effectively plan, supervise, coordinate, monitor, and evaluate child and family service programs;

(8) developing information useful in reviewing prime sponsorship applications under section 104 and of comprehensive child and family service plans under section 106.

(b) In order to receive funds under this section, a State shall establish a Child and Family Service Council as prescribed in section 104 (a).

(c) Funds received by the State under this section shall be in addition to any funds such State may receive under this title pursuant to an approved prime sponsorship application and comprehensive child and family service plan.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAMS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION

SEC. 109. (a) Applications for financial assistance for projects including construction or acquisition may be approved only if the prime sponsor, or the Secretary in cases of applications submitted for his approval, determines that construction or acquisition of such facilities is essential to the provision of adequate child care services, and that rental, lease, or lease-purchase, remodeling, or renovation of adequate facilities is not practicable.

(b) If any facility assisted under this title shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds unless the Secretary determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction, remodeling, renovation, or alteration projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(d) In the case of loans for construction, the Secretary shall prescribe the interest rate and the period within which such loan shall be repaid, but such interest rate shall not be less than 3 per centum per annum and the period within which such loan is to be repaid shall not be more than twenty-five years.

(e) The Federal assistance for construction, remodeling, renovation, alteration, or acquisition of facilities, may be in the form of grants or loans. Repayment of loans shall, to the extent required by the Secretary, be returned to the prime sponsor from whose financial assistance the loan was made, or used for additional loans or grants under this title. Not more than 15 per centum of the total financial assistance provided to a prime sponsor under this title shall be used for construction of facilities, with no more than 7½ per centum of such assistance usable for grants for construction. Financial assistance for construction or acquisition of facilities pursuant to this Act shall be available only to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations.

USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE PROGRAMS

SEC. 110. (a) The Secretary, after consultation with other appropriate officials of the Federal Government, shall within eighteen months after enactment of this Act report to the Congress with respect to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by Federal departments, agencies, and independent authorities could be made available to public and private agencies and organizations, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child and family service programs under this title during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with his recommendations (including recommendations for changes in legislation) or proposed actions for such use.

(b) The Secretary may require, as a condition to the receipt of assistance under this title, that any prime sponsor under this title agree to conduct a review and provide the Secretary with a report as to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by such prime sponsor, or by other agencies in the prime sponsorship area, could be made available, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child and family service programs under this title during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with the prime sponsor's proposed actions for such use.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 111. (a) In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall pay from the applicable allocation or apportionment under section 103 the Federal share of the costs of programs, services, and activities, in accordance with plans or applications which have been approved as provided in this title. In making such payment to any prime sponsor, the Secretary shall include in such costs an amount for staff and other administrative expenses for the Child and Family Service Councils and for parent policy committees, consistent with limitations contained in this title.

(b) The Secretary shall pay from funds appropriated under section 3 (a) for fiscal year 1975 an amount equal to 100 per centum of the cost of planning, training, and technical assistance.

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, the Secretary shall pay from funds appropriated under section 3 (b) for fiscal year 1976 an amount not in excess of 90 per centum and from funds appropriated under section 3 (b) for fiscal year 1977 and subsequent years an amount not to exceed 80 per centum of the cost of carrying out programs, services, and activities under this title. The Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, approve assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines that such action is required to provide adequately for the child and family service needs of economically disadvantaged children.

(2) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child and family service programs for children of migrant agricultural workers under this title.

(3) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child and family

service programs for children in Indian tribal organizations under this title.

(c) The non-Federal share of the costs of programs assisted under this title may be provided through public or private funds and may be in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities (or portions thereof that are used for program purposes), reasonably evaluated, or union or employer contributions. Fees collected for services shall not be used for the non-Federal share, but shall be used by the prime sponsor to improve and expand programs under the comprehensive child development and family service plan.

(d) If, with respect to any fiscal year, a prime sponsor or project applicant provides non-Federal contributions or any program, service, or activity exceeding its requirements, such excess may be applied toward meeting the requirements, for such contributions for the subsequent fiscal year under this title.

(e) No State or unit of general local government shall reduce its expenditures for child development or child care programs by reason of assistance under this title.

TITLE II—STANDARDS AND EVALUATIONS

FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR CHILD CARE

SEC. 201. (a) (1) Within six months after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after consultation with other Federal agencies and with the approval of the committee established pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child care services under this or any other Federal Act, to be known as the Federal Standards for Child Care.

(2) Such standards shall replace but shall be consistent with the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements as approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor on September 23, 1968. The 1968 requirements will continue to apply to all applicable programs until program standards required by subsection (a) are promulgated.

(3) Not less than sixty days prior to implementation of program standards pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary shall submit such proposed program standards to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. Upon majority vote of either committee within such sixty days disapproving such proposed program standards, such standards shall not take effect.

(b) The Secretary shall establish policies and procedures, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, to assure that all programs and projects assisted under this Act address, on a continuing basis, the individual needs of and the appropriateness of child development and family service for the very young and other children served—

(1) any program or project providing care outside the home for very young children shall be reviewed and evaluated periodically and frequently by the Secretary, to insure that it meets the highest standards of quality; and the Secretary may reserve such funds as he deems necessary from funds available under this Act for the purpose of evaluation, by appropriate persons, of programs under this Act in order to insure compliance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(2) no program or project described in clause (1) of this subsection shall be approved for assistance under this Act unless it is specifically authorized and approved by the Secretary.

(c) (1) Upon determination that a prime sponsor or project is in violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall give immediate public notice of such determination to such prime sponsor or project and, if such violation or violations have not been corrected, shall commence action within ninety days of such determination to withhold funds under section 204.

(2) Upon determination that a project is in violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the prime

sponsor shall give immediate notice of such determination to such project and, if such violation or violations have not been corrected, shall commence action within ninety days of such determination to withhold funds under section 204.

(c) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after enactment of this Act, appoint a Special Committee on Federal Standards for Child Care, which shall include parents of children enrolled in Headstart and child care programs, representatives of public and private agencies and organizations administering such programs, specialists, and other public and private providers of child and family services, individuals engaged in licensing activities, and others interested in services for children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children participating in programs conducted under title I of this Act and section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and title IV-A of the Social Security Act, or other public programs providing child and family services. Such committee shall participate in the development of Federal Standards for child care and modifications thereof as provided in subsection (a).

(d) In no event shall any prime sponsor or program or project receiving assistance under this Act reduce the quality of services provided under this Act below the standards established in this section.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM CODE FOR FACILITIES

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, appoint a special committee to develop a uniform minimum code for facilities, to be used in licensing child and family services facilities. Such standards shall deal principally with these matters essential to the health, safety, and physical comfort of the children and the relationship of such matters to the Federal Standards for child care developed under section 201.

(b) The special committee appointed under this section shall include parents of children enrolled in comprehensive child services programs and representatives of State and local licensing agencies, public health officials, fire prevention officials, the construction industry and unions, public and private agencies or organizations administering comprehensive child services programs, and national agencies or organizations interested in services for children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children enrolled in programs conducted under this title, section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and title IV of the Social Security Act.

(c) Within six months of its appointment, the special committee shall complete a proposed uniform code and shall hold public hearings on the proposed code prior to submitting its final recommendation to the Secretary for his approval.

(d) The Secretary must approve the code as a whole or secure the concurrence of the special committee to changes therein, and, upon approval, such standards shall be applicable to all facilities receiving Federal financial assistance under this Act or in which programs receiving such Federal financial assistance are operated; and the Secretary shall also distribute such standards and urge their adoption by States and local governments. The Secretary may from time to time modify the uniform code for facilities in accordance with the procedures described in subsections (a) through (d).

PROGRAM MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall provide, through the Office of Child and Family Services, for regular and periodic monitoring of programs under this Act to assure compliance with the child care standards and other requirements of this Act, and shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of sufficient trained staff in such office to accomplish the purpose of this section.

WITHHOLDING OF GRANTS

SEC. 204. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to any prime sponsor, or project applicant, finds—

(1) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the plan

of any such prime sponsor approved under section 106; or

(2) that there has been a failure to comply with applicable standards pursuant to section 201; or

(3) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the application of any such project applicant approved pursuant to section 107; or

(4) that in the operation of any plan, program, or project carried out by any such prime sponsor, or project applicant or other recipient of financial assistance under this Act there is a failure to comply substantially with any applicable provision of this Act or regulation promulgated thereunder;

the Secretary shall notify such prime sponsor, project applicant, or other recipient of his findings and that no further payments may be made to such sponsor, project applicant, or other recipient under this Act (or in the Secretary's discretion that any such prime sponsor shall not make further payments under this Act to specified project applicants affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or that the noncompliance will be promptly corrected. The Secretary may authorize the continuation of payments with respect to any project assisted under this Act which is being carried out pursuant to such plan or application and which is not involved in any noncompliance.

EVALUATION

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall make an evaluation of Federal involvement in child and family services, which shall include—

(1) enumeration and description of all Federal activities which affect child and family service programs;

(2) analysis of expenditures of Federal funds for such activities and services;

(3) determination of the effectiveness of such activities and services;

(4) the extent to which preschool, minority group, and economically disadvantaged children and their parents have participated in programs under this Act; and

(5) such recommendations to Congress as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

(b) The results of the evaluation required by subsection (a) of this section shall be reported to Congress not later than two years after enactment of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall establish such procedures as may be necessary to conduct an annual evaluation of Federal involvement in child and family services programs, and shall report the results to each such evaluation to Congress.

(d) Prime sponsors and project applicants assisted under this Act and departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall, upon request by the Secretary or the Comptroller General of the United States make available, consistent with other provisions of law, such information as the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of making the evaluation required under subsection (c) of this section, or the Comptroller General determines is necessary for an independent evaluation.

(e) The Secretary may enter into contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) The Secretary shall reserve for the purposes of this section not less than 1 per centum, but not more than 2 per centum, of the amounts available under section 3 (b) of this Act for any fiscal year.

TITLE III—FACILITIES AND RESEARCH FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PROGRAMS

MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR COMPREHENSIVE CHILD SERVICES FACILITIES

SEC. 301. (a) It is the purpose of this section to assist and encourage the provision of urgently needed facilities for child care and comprehensive child services programs.

(b) For the purpose of this section—

(1) The term "child and family services facility"

means a facility of a public or private profit or nonprofit agency or organization, licensed or regulated by the State (or, if there is no State law providing for such licensing and regulation by the State, by the municipality or other political subdivision in which the facility is located), for the provision of comprehensive child services programs.

(2) The terms "mortgage", "mortgagor", "mortgagee", "maturity date", and "State" shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207 of the National Housing Act.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on such mortgage during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and make commitments for insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon.

(d) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new child and family services facility, including equipment to be used in its operation, subject to the following conditions.

(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor, approved by the Secretary, who shall demonstrate ability successfully to operate one or more child care or child and family services programs. The Secretary may in his discretion require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to minimum charges and methods of financing, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Secretary may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Secretary under the insurance.

(2) The mortgagor shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $250,000 and not to exceed 90 per centum of the estimated replacement cost of the property or project (including equipment replacement cost of the property or project, including equipment to be used in the operation of the facility) when the proposed improvements are completed and the equipment is installed.

(3) The mortgage shall—

(A) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Secretary shall prescribe, and

(B) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charges, if any) at not to exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding at any time as the Secretary finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

(4) The Secretary shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he has determined that the comprehensive child services facility to be covered by the mortgage will be in compliance with the Uniform Code for Facilities approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 202 of this Act.

(5) The Secretary shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he determines the facility is consistent with and will not hinder the program of child and family services under title I of this Act.

(e) The Secretary shall fix and collect premium charges for the insurance of mortgages under this section which shall be payable annually in advance by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures of the Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund (established by subsection (h)) issued at par plus accrued interest. In the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any one time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. In addition to the premium charge herein provided for, the Secretary is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for the appraisal of a property or project during construction; but such charges for appraisal and inspection shall not aggregate more than 1 per centum of the original principal fee amount of the mortgage.

(f) The Secretary may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

(g) (1) The Secretary shall have the same functions, powers, and duties (insofar as applicable) with respect to the insurance of mortgages under this section as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has with respect to the insurance of mortgages under title II of the National Housing Act.

(2) The provisions of subsections (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 of the National Housing Act shall apply to mortgages insured under this section; except that, for purposes of their application with respect to such mortgages, all references in such provisions

to the General Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund, and all references in such provisions to "Secretary" shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(h) (1) There is hereby created a Child and Family Services Facility Insurance Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund for carrying out all the insurance provisions of this section. All mortgages insured under this section shall be insured under and by the obligation of the fund.

(2) The general expenses of the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to mortgages insured under this section may be charged to the fund.

(3) Moneys in the fund not needed for the current operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to mortgages insured under this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Secretary may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued as obligations of the fund. Such purchases shall be made at

a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

(4) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage under this section, the receipts derived from property covered by such mortgages and from any claims, debts, contracts, property, and security assigned to the Secretary in connection therewith, and all earnings on the assets of the fund, shall be credited to the fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures which are the obligation of the fund, cash insurance payments and adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired, in connection with mortgages insured under this section, shall be charged to the fund.

(5) There are authorized to be appropriated to provide initial capital for the fund, and to assure the soundness of the fund thereafter, such sums as may be necessary.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary is authorized to carry out a program of research and demonstration projects, which shall include but not be limited to—

(1) research to develop techniques to measure and

evaluate child and family services, and to develop standards to evaluate professional and paraprofessional child and family service personnel;

(2) research to test preschool programs emphasizing reading and reading readiness;

(3) preventive medicine and techniques and technology, including multiphasic screening and testing, to improve the early diagnosis and treatment of diseases and learning disabilities of pre-school children;

(4) research to test alternative methods of providing child and family service;

(5) evaluation of research findings and the development of these findings and the effective application thereof;

(6) dissemination and application of research and development efforts and demonstration projects to child and family service and related programs and early childhood education, using regional demonstration centers and advisory services where feasible;

(7) production of informational systems and other resources necessary to support the activities authorized by this Act;

(8) developing methods of determining the needs of individual children in particular areas such as education, nutrition, and medical services, so as to permit the

modification of programs to fit the needs of individual children; and

(9) a study of the need on a nationwide basis for child and family services programs and of the resources, including personnel, which are available to meet this need.

(b) In order to carry out the program provided for in this section, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts or other arrangements with public or private agencies (including other Government agencies), organizations, institutions, and individuals.

(c) (1) The Secretary shall coordinate, through the Office of Child and Family Services established under section 101 (a), all child and family services research, training, and development efforts conducted within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and, to the extent feasible, by other agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(2) Funds available to any Federal department or agency for the purposes of this title shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Secretary for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and the funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Secretary through the Office of Child and

Family Services established under section 101 (a), for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

(d) The Secretary shall conduct special demonstration, and model programs, which demonstration, and model programs shall be subject to the fullest extent practicable to each of the requirements with respect to project applications under section 107.

(e) The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than September 1, 1975, summarizing his activities and accomplishments under this section during the preceding fiscal year and the grants, contracts, or other arrangements entered into and making such recommendations (including recommendations for legislation) as he may deem appropriate.

TITLE IV—TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FOR CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

TRAINING

SEC. 401. Congress recognizes that one of the major barriers hindering the development of quality child services at the present time is the lack of sufficiently trained and prepared professional and paraprofessional staff; and the continued entry of mothers of young children into full-time employment outside the home, will, in the future, place an intolerable strain on the already limited numbers of personnel qualified for work in early childhood programs; that the development of quality programs depends, therefore, on the availability of trained personnel in far greater numbers than present training programs can respond to; and finally, that parents can be helped effectively to use child service methods with their own children that will lessen or prevent the need for compensatory education programs for older children.

SEC. 402. It is the purpose of this title to respond to the demonstrated need for child services personnel in the 1970's; by stimulating the development of sufficient training and educational programs in every State and region of the United States to assure an adequate supply of personnel to meet staffing requirements.

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, State and local agencies, State and local educational agencies, private organizations and agencies engaged in teacher training, teacher training institutions, national child care organizations, and producers of television programing, for the purpose of establishing, developing, or upgrading early childhood personnel training programs which shall include, but shall not be limited to, the development of programs to—

(A) provide postgraduate level training for teachers of professional and paraprofessional early childhood personnel and for teachers of teachers of such personnel;

(B) attract and recruit personnel, both male and female, including students and older Americans, to training for and subsequent employment in child care programs;

(C) retrain personnel prepared for and/or experienced in education at levels other than early childhood so as to enable them to function effectively in early childhood programs;

(D) provide preservice and inservice training of professional and paraprofessional personnel for teaching, management and supervisory, and administrative posts in early childhood programs, including the training and certification of Child Development Associates;

(E) help parents and high school students understand and practice sound child care techniques;

(F) develop educational television programs and other materials for training early childhood personnel, parents, and high school students;

(G) develop and refine certification criteria and techniques for professional and paraprofessional early childhood personnel.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 405. Section 501 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "There is additionally authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each fiscal year thereafter for programs and projects under this part to train or retrain professional personnel for comprehensive child services programs, and the sum of $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for each fiscal year thereafter, for programs and projects under this part to train or retrain nonprofessional personnel for such programs.".

SEC. 406. Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act is amended as follows, by adding after the word "nonprofit" each time it occurs the phrase "comprehensive child services program," by striking out "and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(C) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as so determined by regulations) of service as a full-time teacher in public or private nonprofit comprehensive child services programs or in any such programs operating under authority of title I of the Child and Family Services Act, and (D)".

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is authorized to award grants to individuals employed in comprehensive child services programs operating under the authority of title I of this Act and to such programs for the purposes of meeting the costs of ongoing inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel, including volunteers, to be conducted by an agency carrying on a child and family services program by a community or higher education institution, or by a combination thereof.

SEC. 408. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of section 403 the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975 and for each succeeding fiscal year.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 501. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa,

the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(3) "child and family service programs" means programs on a full-day or part-day basis which provide or arrange for the provision of the educational, nutritional, health, and other services needed to provide the opportunity for children to attain their full potential, including services to other family members;

(4) "children" means individuals who have not attained the age of fifteen;

(5) "economically disadvantaged children" means any children of a family having an annual income below the lower living standard budget (adjusted for regional and metropolitan, urban, and rural differences, and family size), as determined annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at the Department of Labor;

(6) "handicapped children" includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services;

(7) "program" includes any program, service, or activity, which is conducted full- or part-time in the home, in schools, or in child care facilities;

(8) "parent" means any person who has primary day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(9) "single parent" means any person who has sole day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(10) "working mother" means any mother who needs child or family service in order to undertake or continue full- or part-time employment, training, or education outside the home;

(11) "minority group" includes, but is not limited to, persons who are Negro, American Indian, Spanish-surnamed American, Portuguese, or Oriental, and, as determined by the Secretary, children who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English and who, as a result of language barriers, may need special assistance, and, for the purpose of this paragraph, "Spanish-surnamed Americans" includes, but is not limited to, persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish origin or ancestry;

(12) "bilingual" includes, but is not limited to persons who are Spanish-surnamed Americans, American Indian, Oriental, Portuguese, or others who have learned during childhood to speak the language of the minority group of which they are members and who, as a result of language barriers, may need special assistance;

(13) "local educational agency" means any such

agency as defined in section [illegible]01 (f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(14) "unit of general local government" means any political subdivision of a State having general governmental powers.

NUTRITION SERVICES

SEC. 502. In accordance with the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish procedures to assure that adequate nutrition services will be provided in child and family services programs under this Act. Such services shall make use of the special food service program for children as defined under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act of 1946 and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, to the fullest extent appropriate and consistent with the provisions of such Acts.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless the grant, contract, or agreement with respect to such program specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any program, program participant, or any applicant for participation in such program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation or beliefs.

(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act. The Secretary shall enforce the provisions of the preceding sentence in accordance with section 602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken by the Secretary to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if that person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act.

(c) The Secretary may make such grants, contracts, or agreements, establish such procedures, policies, rules, and regulations and make such payments in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including necessary adjustments in payments on account of overpayments or underpayments. Subject to the provisions of section 504, the Secretary may also withhold funds otherwise payable under this Act in order to recover any amounts expended in the current or immediately prior fiscal year in violation of any provision of this Act on any term or condition of assistance under this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program, service, or activity under this Act unless he determines that persons employed thereunder, other than persons who serve without compensation, shall be paid wages which shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of—

(1) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), if section 6(a)(1) of such Act applied to the participant and if he were not exempt under section 13 thereof;

(2) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment; or

(3) the prevailing rates of pay for persons employed in similar occupations by the same employer.

(e) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless he determines that no funds will be used for and no person will be employed under the program in the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is for use for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship.

SPECIAL PROHIBITIONS AND PROTECTIONS

SEC. 504. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical, or other development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law.

(b) The Secretary is directed to establish appropriate procedures to insure that no child shall be the subject of any research or experimentation under this Act unless the parent or guardian of such child informed of such research or experimentation and is given an opportunity as a right to except such child therefrom.

(c) A child participating in a program assisted under this Act shall not undergo medical or psychological examination, experimentation or research, immunization (except to the extent necessary to protect the public from epidemics of contagious diseases or in the case of medical emergencies where parental consent cannot be readily obtained), or treatment without the written permission of his parent or guardian based upon full understanding of the procedures and possible consequences.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

SEC. 505. Applications for designation as prime sponsors, comprehensive child development plans, project applications, and all written material pertaining thereto shall be made readily available without charge to the public by the prime sponsor, the applicant, and the Secretary.

COORDINATION WITH EXISTING AUTHORITY

SEC. 506. (a) After consultation with the head of any agency of the Federal Government immediately responsible for providing Federal assistance for child and family services, and related programs, including title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 222 (a) (2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1966, title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 and titles IV and VI of the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish regulations to assure the coordination of all such programs with the programs assisted under this Act.

(b) The day care services furnished as a part of the child care services furnished under a State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, or as a part of the child welfare services furnished under a State plan developed as provided in part B of such title, shall be day care services made available under title I of this Act, and such services shall be deemed to meet the requirements of section 422(a)(1)(C) of the Social Security Act. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations and make such arrangements as may be necessary or appropriate to insure that suitable child and family services programs under this Act are available for children receiving aid or services under State plans approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act and State plans developed as provided in part B of such title to the extent that such programs are required for the administration of such plans and the achievement of their objectives, and that there is effective coordination between the comprehensive child services programs under this Act and the programs of aid and services under such title IV.

(c)(1) Section 203(j)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "or civil defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "civil defense, or the operation of child care facilities".

(2) Section 203(j)(3) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out, in the first sentence, "or public health" and inserting in lieu thereof "public health, or the operation of child care facilities";

(B) by inserting after "handicapped," in clause (A) and clause (B) of the first sentence the following: "child care facilities": and

(C) by inserting after "public health purposes" and the second sentence, the following: ", or for the operation of child care facilities,"

ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 507. In carrying out the purposes and provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to accept and use funds appropriated to carry out other provisions of Federal law if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

Mr. **Brademas.** We are pleased today to have with us four witnesses. Our first witness is a widely regarded authority in this entire field, Dr. Sheldon H. White, Professor of Psychology at Harvard University.

Dr. White, we are very pleased indeed to have you with us, sir.

STATEMENT OF DR. SHELDON H. WHITE, A.B., M.A., PH. D., PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Dr. **White.** Thank you.

My testimony is based upon the report, Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations, prepared under my direction. The report was done for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in HEW and submitted on September 15, 1972. Its purpose was to consider carefully the needs of disadvantaged children, to study the effectiveness of Federal programs directed at those needs, and to make recommendations about the future directions of Federal efforts.

The first volume of the report attempts to define the conditions or circumstances of disadvantages in childhood. It attempts to identify those several populations of American children who are now disadvantaged. It reviews child development data pertinent to the sensitive questions about early intervention. Finally, it reviews the tests and indices now used to evaluate intervention programs.

The second volume of the report examines the evaluation studies of major areas of Federal intervention on behalf of children—programs in early education, preschool, day care, family intervention, and health care.

The third volume of the report offers recommendations for Federal efforts. My testimony here today will be based on those recommendations, and on the thinking that led to those recommendations.

Some people have read the report as a massive documentation of the argument that "nothing works" in programs for children. Looking at the uncertain patterns of evidence arguing for programs for children, they argue that such programs must be meaningless, not worth the money and the effort, a fundamentally cruel set of sops and illusions held out to disadvantaged children and their families.

Having spent so much time and effort in the preparation of a report which offers so much apparent negativity, I feel I have some responsibility to offer what I believe to be the most reasonable possible interpretation of the findings.

My judgment is that childhood disadvantage does exist in this country. It is real. It comes in various forms. It is necessary to set forth governmentally sponsored programs to deal with it. Some of the programs that have so far been set forward on behalf of those children have some promise and are probably helping the children and their families. New programs and new governmental actions are needed.

The report from which some people have taken simple conclusions is long, burdensomely long. I feel apologetic about that. We were asked to go through the evidence and we simply had to wade through it. But, as long as the report is, the issues and evidence contained in the report must only be understood as a whole. Those who are depressed by the lengthy list of negative evaluations of programs offered in volume 2 must, I am afraid, also allow themselves to be depressed by the lengthy list of problems in doing evaluations offered in volume 1.

Those who are depressed by our seeming inability to correct the "deprivations" or "deficits" of children must spend some time considering those parts of the report in which we try to consider at length what childhood disadvantage is.

There is no certain, simple, easy way to read data and have the data tell one what to do. One uses data to try to construct a picture, a picture of what the problems really are and of what the possibilities of answers might be. This is the true way in which science works and if science, proceeding in areas of relative precision and certainty, must rely on estimation and intuition, so much the more must we do so with data bearing upon social problems. We tried, in doing the report, to form a picture. We tried to find out what the questions of childhood disadvantage really are.

At times we gave great weight to rather small segments of data that seemed informative. At times we tended to discount largish masses of data that seemed misleading; for instance, the bulk of the negative evaluations.

I might state flatly that I no longer believe in the possibility of objective evaluations of most of the kinds of Government programs discussed in the report. One can use data to establish findings about such programs, sometimes very useful and helpful findings about their effects. But I am no longer persuaded that we usually know how to provide data by which summary judgments of good or bad, worthwhile or worthless, can be arrived at.

In the remainder of my testimony, I will be concerned to discuss the picture arrived at in the course of doing the report. The picture is a construction from the facts, an estimation. I cannot guarantee that others would make the same construction from the facts, although I can state that others with whom I have discussed the report seem to see similar pictures. I will not discuss the specific recommendations; they are embodied in the report. What seems most germane for discussion today is the general shape of the problems, the questions of where and how children's needs arise in our society today.

Whether or not the public should participate in child rearing is not an issue today. That issue was settled long ago when Common Schooling was created, when the child care professions—teaching, social work, pediatrics, et cetera—were established and given legal scope, and when State and Federal agencies assumed responsibilities for the care and protection of children.

In our society, child care is accomplished via a complex set of social bargains by which the work of the child's family is fitted together with educational, health, and social service institutions. Parents rear children until they are 6. Then a large segment of the child's life is given to the schools. The parents base their activities on expectations about what schools will do. The schools operate on the basis of expectations about what parents have done and will do.

There is a division of labor between families and schools. Similarly, there are divisions of labor between families and health services and between families and other public agencies involved in the welfare of the child. If there is not a family, or if the family has difficulty, public agencies may temporarily or permanently assume responsibility for the child.

It would be nice if things could be simpler. It would be nice if we could return to a day in which families could assume an almost exclusive responsibility for the care, protection, education, and social upbringing of their children. Or, alternatively, it would be nice if we could get the whole business of child rearing on an institutional basis, bureaucratize it, professionalize it, monetize it, and then streamline the whole process by modern management techniques.

Alas, we can do neither. Children, those whom we bring forward to the future, are our most profound victims of "future shock." They will have something like a family. They will have people who care for them in a special way, whom they can care for, who can form the center of their adjustment to society. And yet, those children and their families have come to depend upon professionals and public agencies to provide resources and skills that families by themselves can no longer provide. Hence, we live with bargains through which many hands share in bringing the child forward to adulthood.

Most of the needs of children today arise out of the traditional bargains or must be quickly related to them. There are no real novelties. A child needs nutrition, care, protection, medical attention, education, moral and religious upbringing, et cetera.

All those needs have been known for some time. They have been recognized in a long series of public actions on behalf of children. All the problems of children—abuse, neglect, poor health, family weakness, et cetera—are "on the books," addressed in existing legislation or agency missions, most of them several times over. Yet, even with our present supply of facilities and agencies and professionals, we find current arguments that childhood disadvantage exists. Why?

Many of our bargains are built upon old and too-simple conceptions of professional services. Once schooling could be seen as optional competition for a favored place in society.

Now it is vital for social survival. Once, optimal health care could be realized by providing for a nearby general practitioner. Now, optimal health care can only be achieved through access to complex facilities for the delivery of health care. New and different demands have been placed on families and professionals.

Many of our old bargains were limited in the parties involved. Once, one could arrange for education as a transaction between schools and a kind of standard mainstream family, assuming or hoping that the melting pot would shortly make all families mainstream families. Now we know that the melting pot has not fully melted. We must live with a pluralistic society. Schooling and school-related services must rest on not one but a set of bargains.

Social change has brought new needs for negotiation. Industrialization and urbanization have increasingly brought families into situations where they need help in the care for their children. Women have gone to work. There are needs for child care and protection not provided for in the older arrangements.

Finally, we need new bargains simply because we have made so many old bargains. We have piled program upon program, agency upon agency, professional upon professional, so that everywhere there arises the cry for simplification, for coordination, for comprehensiveness. As our public activities have grown larger and more complex, so have they grown more remote and more awkward, less susceptible to the control and understanding of the people they serve. Both parties have tried to address this—the Democrats with things like Community Action programs and parent advisory councils, the Republicans with things like the New Federalism and revenue sharing. But local flexibility, local sensitivity is still not fully there.

Our basic problem is change. Call the trend of the times economic movements, progress, creeping socialism, enlightenment, social evolution, or whatever. We need to address changes in the relations of families to society.

We face children's problems that are, in a sense, unchanging. There are problems of handicap, of prejudice, of abuse and neglect, of poor education, of poor health and poor health care. One has trouble counting them, fixing their absolute number, but there is little doubt that they are there. There are some problems that we have never known how to fix, but there are others that are expressive of the present poor fit between our purposes and our agencies.

We work on the basis of public purposes that seem largely unchanged. Our society has for a long time accepted certain thematic issues as fit and proper for public action, for legislation and for the expenditure of public money. We handled those issues in one way in the 19th Century, in another at the turn of this century. Now we must find new ways in the latter half of the 20th Century.

The leadership in renegotiation, in the establishment of a new set of bargains, must come from the Federal level. Only at the Federal level can one address what are now national norms and standards for institutions, for professional certification, for tests, for expectations about children and their families. Only at the Federal level can one pose issues to the Nation. Only through the Federal level can one transmit new programs and new bargains for widespread adoption.

No one piece of legislation can do all that has to be done. We will need legislation, enlightened agency management, research, and development efforts. What will we be trying to bring about?

We will be trying to support families in their efforts to care for children. We will be trying to minimize those pressures and strains that bring about abandonment, abuse, and neglect.

We will be trying to create new patterns in housing, urban design, services, and recreation that will be more amenable to families and their care of children. We are, some of us, quite alarmed today about problems in physical ecology. I believe we may have some contemporary problems worth considering in social ecology.

We will be trying to create more flexible couplings between families and allied health, educational, and social services. We will be trying to diversify the bargains between families and services, so that more people will be let into the bargains.

We will be trying to reduce the individual and institutional prejudice that blights the lives of so many minority children.

We will be trying to create a pluralism in education, a social pluralism and an intellectual pluralism. We will be trying to make schools more receptive to children with diverse mores and languages. We will be trying to make schools receptive to diverse patterns of human ability, more responsive to the diverse needs of our society for talent and training.

We will be trying to help parents to understand and work with the schools, to help schools understand and work with the parents.

We will be trying to change the stereotyped definitions of human merit, achievement, and status which, long ago, social Darwinism deposited into our thinking and our system. No longer the sacred trinity of IQ, school achievement, and SES. Our tests and our thinking will have to respect the fact that there is more than one kind of human ability, more than one kind of learning, more than one kind of way to make a contribution and to have status in society.

We will be reconsidering the diverse new child care professions that have come into existence in the movements of this century. In some areas, we will be trying to strengthen the hand of the professionals in the social bargains in which they now play a part, trying to create conditions in which it becomes more possible for them to exercise their function. In others, we will be following the contemporary impulse to deprofessionalize, deinstitutionalize services to children.

We will be trying to find new ways to identify early handicaps in childhood and, as we find them, trying to diagnose and treat as early as we can.

We will be trying to create agencies at the local level that can be flexible and responsive in their offering to the needs of children and their families, capable of recognizing diverse problems and capable of responding in diverse ways. We will be trying to simplify and make more effective the superordinate governmental structures at State and Federal levels.

A long list. It could be longer, I am afraid. The essence of the issue is to address a situation in which unchanging public purposes and basic needs of children are addressed in social arrangements that must evolve and change with the times. I believe we should try to make those changes and I have some faith that if we do so we can make the arrangements better.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dr. White, for a very thoughtful statement. And I would at this point ask unanimous consent to insert in the record, following your testimony, related background materials, and articles.

[The information referred to appears in the appendix on p. 307.]

CURRICULUM VITA, MAY 1973

Name: Sheldon H(arold) White.

Birthdate: November 30, 1928.

Place of Birth: New York City.

Home Address: 214 Upland Road, Newtonville, Massachusetts 02160. Telephone, 244-1126.

Office Address: Larsen Hall, Appian Way, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Telephone, 495-3548.

Marital Status: Married, two children.

Education: A.B., Harvard College, 1951, cum laude; M.A., Boston University, 1952; Ph.D. State University of Iowa, 1957. (Dissertation: Generalization of an instrumental response with variation in two attributes of the CS. Sponsor: Dr. Charles Spiker.)

Military Service: U.S. Army, 1952-54.

EXPERIENCE

1952–54. Research assistant, Army Medical Service Graduate School, Walter Reed AMC, Washington, D.C. (in service).

1954–57. Research assistant, Institute of Child Behavior and Development, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

1957–63, 1964–65. Instructor to Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Chicago.

1963–64. Research Fellow in Cognitive Studies, Center for Cognitive Studies, and Lecturer, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University.

Summer, 1965. Lecturer, Institute of Child Development, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

1965–67. Associate Professor of Education and Cognitive Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1967–68. Professor of Education and Cognitive Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1968–1973. Roy E. Larsen Professor of Educational Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1973–. Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1973–. Member, Faculty of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1970–1971. Director, Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1973–. Chairman, Program in Personality and Developmental Studies, Department of Psychology and Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1966–1970. Consultant, Study Section, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland.

1966–1969. Consultant, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

1968–1971. Member, Research Advisory Council, Follow Through Program, U.S. Office of Education.

1964–. Editor, Developmental Processes and Behavior series, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

1967–1969. Associate Editor, *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, 3d edition.

1968–1971. Consultant, Harvard Project Nutrition.

1968–1970. Consultant, Children's Television Workshop.

1968–1971. Consultant to Office of Economic Opportunity for Westinghouse evaluation of Head Start, Performance Incentive Contracts experiment.

1968–1970. Member, Advisory Board, National Laboratory for Early Childhood Education.

1970–1971. Member, National Advisory Council for the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

1963. Associate Editor, *Child Development*.

1963–1968. Consulting Editor, *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*.

1964–. Corresponding Editor, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*.

1968–1971. Consulting Editor, *Development Psychology*.

1971–. Board of Directors, Huron Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1971–1972. Project Director, Disadvantaged Child Development Cost Analysis, Contract HEW–OS–71–170, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning, HEW.

1971–. Member, Committee on Federal Agency Evaluation Research, National Research Council.

1973–. Member, Board of Visitors, Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh.

Professional Societies: American Psychological Association (Fellow); Sigma Xi; American Association for the Advancement of Science; Society for Research in Child Development; Association for Child Psychology and Psychiatry; Society for Psychophysiological Research.

PUBLICATIONS

Schein, E. H., White, S. H., and Hill, W. F. The organization of communication in small problem-solving groups. *Amer. Psychologist*, 1955, 10, 357–358.

White, S. H. Generalization of an instrumental response with variation in two attributes of the CS. *J. Exp. Psychol.*, 1958, 56, 339–343.

Spiker, C. C. and White, S. H. Differential conditioning by children as a function of effort required in the task. *Child Develpm.*, 1959, 30, 1–7.

White, S. H. and Spiker, C. C. The effect of a variable conditioned stimulus upon the generalization of an instrumental response. *Child Develpm.*, 1960, 31, 313–319.

White, S. H., Spiker, C. C., and Holton, R. B. Associative transfer as shown by response speeds in motor paired-associates learning. *Child Develpm.*, 1960, 31, 609–616.

White, S. H. The effects of pretraining with varied stimuli in children's discrimination learning. *Child Develpm.*, 1961, 32, 745–753.

White, S. H. psychology. *Encyclopedia Britannica Book of the Year*, 1961–1965.

White, S. H. A note on intensity generalization and prothetic scaling. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1962, 69, 149–155.

White, S. H. and Grim, P. F. Investigations of a voluntary generalization paradigm. *Amer. Psychologist*, 1962, 17, 378.

White, S. H. and Plum, G. E. Children's eye movements during a discrimination series. Amer. Psychologist, 1962, 17, 367.

White, S. H. Research on attentional processes in learning. Progress Report, USPHS Grant M–3639, 1962.

White, S. H. Learning. In H. W. Stevenson (Ed.) *Child Psychology. 62nd Yearb. Nat. Soc. Stud. Educ.* Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

White, S. H. and Plum, G. E. Eye movement photography during children's discrimination learning. *J. exp. Child Psychol.*, 1964, 1, 327–338.

White, S. H. Some inferences about orientation and attention during children's learning. Paper presented at symposium, The Development of Attentional Proccess, American Psychological Association convention, Los Angeles, 1964.

White, S. H. Training and timing in the generalization of a voluntary response. *J. Exp. Psychol.*, 1965, *69*, 269–275.

Grim, P. F. and White, S. H. Effects of stimulus change upon the GSR and reaction time. *J. Exp. Psychol.*, 1965, *69*, 276–281.

White, S. H. Evidence for a hierarchical arrangement of learning processes. In L. P. Lipsitt and C. C. Spiker (Eds.) *Advances in child behavior and development.* (Vol. 2) New York: Academic Press, 1965.

White, S. H. Discrimination learning with ever-changing positive and negative cues. *J. Exp. Child Psychol.*, 1965, 2, 154–162.

White, S. H. Age differences in reaction to stimulus variation. In O. J. Harvey (Ed.) *Flexibility, Adaptability and Creativity.* New York: Springer, 1966.

White, S. H. Some educated guesses about cognitive development in the preschool years. In R. Hess and R. Bear (Eds.) *Early education: Current theory, research, and practice.* Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

White, S. H. Learning and cognitive development. Paper presented at NICHD Learning Advisory Conference, Silver Springs, 1966.

White, S. H. The hierarchical organization of intellectual structures. Paper presented at symposium, "The role of experience in intellectual development," American Association for the Advancement of Science convention, Washington, D.C., December, 1966.

White, S. H. Review of "Abstraction and Concept Formation" by Anatol Pikas. *Harvard Educ. Rev.*, 1967, 37, 335–337.

White, S. H. The learning-maturation controversy: Hall to Hull. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 1968, 14, 187–196.

Grim, P. F., Kohlberg, L., and White, S. H. Some relationships between conscience and attentional processes. *J. pers. soc. Psychol.*, 1968, 8, 239–252.

White, S. H. Prefatory remarks: Learning vs. innate factors in cognitive development. Remarks at Open Meeting: Issues in the History of Developmental Psychology. American Psychological Association convention, Washington, D.C., September, 1967.

White, S. H. The analysis of attentional processes during children's learning. Paper presented at symposium, "The study of attention," New England Psychological Association Meeting, Hartford, Conn., November, 1967.

White, S. H. Changes in learning processes in the late preschool years. Paper presented at symposium, "Early Learning," American Educational Research Association convention, Chicago, January, 1968.

Bissell, J., Zivin, G., and White, S. H. Sensory modalities in learning. In G. S. Lesser (Ed.), *Psychology and educational practice.* Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1971.

White, S. H. Developing a practiced eye: Review of The Discrimination Process and Development by Brian J. Fellows. *Contemporary Psychology*, 1969, 14, 160–161.

White, S. H. The learning theory tradition and child psychology. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, 3d ed. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Elias, M. F. and White, S. H. Some psychophysiological and latency correlates of rule induction. *Psychonomic Science*, 1969, 16, 84–85.

White, S. H. Plausibilities and possibilities in early education, *Pediatrics*, 1969, 44, 901–904.

White, S. H. The National Impact Study of Head Start. In J. Hellmuth (Ed.) *The disadvantaged child* (Vol. 3) New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1971.

White, S. H. Some general outlines of the matrix of developmental changes between five and seven years. *Bulletin of the Orton Society*, 1970, 20, 41–57.

White, S. H. and Fishbein, H. Children's learning. In N. Talbot, J. Kagan, and L. Eisenberg (Eds.) *Behavioral Sciences in Pediatrics*. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1971.

White, S. H. Human research and human affairs. In Committee on Education and Labor, *Purpose and process: Readings in educational research and development*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

White, S. H. *et al.*, Federal programs for young children. Vol. 1, Goals and standards of public programs for children; Vol. 2, Review of evaluation data for federally sponsored projects for children; Vol. 3, Recommendations for federal program planning. Report to HEW, Contract HEW–OS–71–170. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Huron Institute, 1972.

White, S. H. Magic, science, and reinforcement: Review of child learning, intelligence, and personality by Arthur W. Staats. *Contemporary Psychology*, 1972, 17, 599–600.

White, S. H. The early education of early childhood education. Paper presented at symposium, "Applied for Action Research: Evaluation," American Sociological Association convention, New Orleans, August, 1972.

White, S. H. Some questions about educational vouchers. Paper presented at panel discussion on education vouchers, Association of American Law Schools meeting, New York City, December, 1972.

White, S. H., and Flagg, B. The nature of the adolescent learning process and its implications for secondary school curriculum. Paper prepared for National Task Force on High School Education, February, 1972.

White, S. H. What should be the goals of child socialization and education efforts and how should they be implemented? Paper prepared for Harvard Interfaculty Seminar on Problems of Child Rearing in Urban America, March, 1973.

Social Implications of the Definition of Intelligence[1]

Sheldon H. White

The first decade of this century was a time when American social arrangements were changing, particularly arrangements for the upbringing of children. It was also a time when major activity patterns of American Psychology were being laid down. We will not fully understand the forms and the growth patterns of American psychology unless we try to see the emerging discipline in the social milieu of that time.

To get a feeling for the social arrangements of the first decade of this century one can read Barbara Tuchman's book, *The Proud Tower*. That time was different from our own. Most of the kings and queens of Europe were in place. There were aristocracies. The aristocrats were dilapidated, nervous, even fatalistic, but they still had a little power. Most of their ancient power was in the hands of the merchant-princes, with whom they shared a love-hate relationship. Of course, the United States had no king and no titles but it did have an Establishment that could get along comfortably with the titled Establishments of Europe.

Read Nicholas Murray Butler's autobiography, *Across the Busy Years*, to get an impression of the life of a pillar of the American Establishment at that time. Butler was active in the widespread conversions of American colleges into American universities near the turn of the century. In 1901, becoming

---

[1] Paper prepared for Symposium, "Intelligence: What Is It?", presented at American Educational Research Association Convention, Chicago, 1974.

President of Columbia University, he entered into the company of the leadership of American affairs. He enjoyed, as he delicately puts it, "worldwide contacts and associations of the greatest possible charm and importance." He visited incessantly at the White House. He was offered opportunities to become a bank president, a railroad president, a governor, a senator. He traveled abroad regularly and was involved in the machinations of international affairs. His autobigraphy radiates a coziness and a comfort that we can hardly imagine today, a leader born in a time when leaders could imagine they were born to lead, an American aristocrat from Paterson, New Jersey.

Contrast Butler with the harassed, short-lived college president of our time and you have one aspect of the difference between then and now. Now consider another difference. There was then explosive radicalism, Anarchism, the Wobblies, the fighting trade unions. For 100-odd years the common man had been coming, since the American and French revolutions, since 1848, since Marx. There was still something a little adventurous and dangerous about active espousal of his cause, but the fight for the common man was in the open. It was engaged.

In the first decade of this century we find a social order more split than our own. The aristocrats were a little more clearly set off as aristocratic. The common man was a little more common. Bridges were being built between them, however. There were renegotiations of the social contracts of that society and those renegotiations would ultimately tend to blur together the aristocrats and the Anarchists. Many of those renegotiations were designed to change the socialization of children.

Common schooling was coming. It had been argued for unsuccessfully since before the Civil War. Now a series of compulsory attendance laws were passed between 1880–1917 and attendance at school became a universal requirement.

There was conflict between common schooling conceived of as homogenizing versus vocational schooling conceived of as training and disciplining a labor force. There was conflict between child education and child labor. In 1900, although 28 states had compulsory school attendance laws, about 1.7 million children under 16 were still in employment. But, in the decades to come, common schooling was to grow and child labor and vocational education were to subside.

Child welfare was coming. There had been a long series of private, city, and state moves against abuse, neglect, and abandonment of children. Now, in the early 1900's, the issue of children's rights became a national issue. The first of the decennial White House Conferences on Children was convened by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909. The Children's Bureau was established in 1912. There ensued a series of state conventions in the decade of the 1910's to reconsider and strengthen state-level laws and practices regarding the treatment of children.

The "whole child" professions were coming. There were efforts to create a science of education and, upon that science, found a true profession of teaching. To this end, there came the incorporation of schools of education within the universities. The young Nicholas Murray Butler, Assistant in Philosophy, Ethics and Psychology, was active in trying to teach Pedagogics and in trying to bring together Columbia College and Teacher's College, a liaison that was effected in 1900. Not only teaching but other professions relevant to the care and socialization of children were being established—social work, pediatrics, and a variety of other school or health-related career lines. A new division of responsibility and labor was being established, reallocating the child rearing responsibilities of family and society. Some traditional parental rights and responsibilities were now to be reassigned to be the responsibility of professionals.

It was amidst the social arrangements and the social changes of that time that American Psychology was born. I believe that most of us share a misunderstanding about the history of American Psychology. We see it too much as something that was created in Wundt's Leipzig laboratory, and too little as something that was given form by American social concerns in the 1900's. The fault is perhaps the fault of E. G. Boring's classic *A History of Experimental Psychology*, a magnificent book that has given most of us our understanding of Psychology's history. Boring was a student of Titchener and Titchener's Structuralism was the most programmatic part of American Psychology before the turn of the century. But Titchener's Wundtian program was over shortly after the turn of the century, superseded by a set of new psychologies that were foreign to it.

If we examine the new Psychologies that seem to suddenly erupt in the 1900's, we see that they were much stimulated by the social concerns of the time, particularly by contemporary interests in creating professional, scientific bases for children's education and socialization.

There was learning theory. In 1898, Thorndike published his first monograph on animal associative learning. By 1904, Pavlov had announced his turn from the study of digestion towards the study of psychic reflexes, and by 1909 we find Pavlov's work under discussion in American journals in a paper by Yerkes and Morgulis. By 1913–1914, Thorndike had published the three volumes of his *Educational Psychology* and Watson had published his "Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It". The learning theory movement was in place.

Note that in Thorndike's mind, learning theory was the cornerstone of a science of education, in Watson's mind Behaviorism was the cornerstone of a science of childrearing. There were the themes of clinical psychology and personality theory. In 1896, Lightner Witmer founded the Psychological Clinic at Pennsylvania. In 1909, William Healy founded what was to become the Institute for Juvenile Research at Chicago. These were the beginnings of the child guidance movement. It was in 1909 that G. Stanley Hall brought Freud, Jung, Ferenezi, and Jones to participate in the 20th anniversary celebrations of Clark University. Theories about the importance of early human personality development, and clinical activity related to these theories, begin at the begining of American psychology.

There was, third, the theme of Child Study, Child study was G. Stanley Hall's educational psychology. Hall founded the Pedagogical Seminary in 1891. He studied the contents of children's minds from 1894 to 1903. By the middle of the first decade of this century there is a sizable bibliography on child study which was the work of many hands other than Hall's. This movement was to wane towards the First World War, taking life again as the Child Development Movement of the late 1920's and early 1930's and coming forward finally to become that amalgam of basic and applied efforts that is characteristic psychological research with children today.

And then, finally, there was the theme of mental testing. The Binet and Simon instrument, first developed in 1905, was the culmination of a long antecedent series of efforts towards the development of mental tests. It shortly became accepted as an intelligence test. Learning theory, clinical psychology, personality theory, child study, . . . all were put in place in the dawning Psychology of that day because of the special feeling at that time that new social sciences would help in the design of the new social contracts. But nothing so instantly leaped into use and relevance as mental testing. The meaning of that test to the social needs of that time was particularly striking and merits some extended discussion.

One of the most interesting things about Binet and Simon's invention is the contrast between the curious indefiniteness of the invention versus the curious definiteness of its social acceptance. What was Binet's test a measure of? Binet and Simon try to tell us:

"It seems to us that in intelligence there is a fundamental faculty, the alternation or the lack of which, is of the utmost importance for practical life. This faculty is judgment, otherwise called good sense, practical sense, initiative, the faculty of adapting one's self to circumstances. To judge well, to comprehend well, to reason well, these are the essential activities of intelligence. A person may be a moron or an imbecile if he is lacking in judgment; but with good judgment, he can never be either. Indeed, the rest of the intellectual faculties seem of little importance in contrast with judgment."

Binet and Simon are here trying to discount the value of the sensory and memory mental testing that had preceded them. Their affirmation of judgment is set in a paper in which the basic items of the Binet-Simon scale are presented and one can easily examine the items to see if they are face valid with respect to the stated criterion of judgment. The items do not look like items tapping judgment; one would guess they tap a complex of entities among which is judgment.

But, Binet and Simon were not clearly sold on judgment as the sine qua non of intelligence. In writings before and after the quote given above, indeed in the very same paper, Binet sponsored a curiously vacillating series of verbal definitions of intelligence, now giving three factors, now giving four or six, with little apparent relationship among the assorted definitions. Spearman, in his *The Nature of 'Intelligence' and the Principles of Cognition* reviews some of Binet's definitional oscillations and finally concludes: "It would seem as if, in this inconstantly flitting hither and thither, Binet can nowhere find a theoretical perch satisfactory for a moment even to himself."

Spearman also reviews some of Simon's writings about intelligence independent of Binet's, and these only compound the problem. In short, in the very delivery of their instrument, Binet and Simon initiated a situation with which we are today quite familiar . . . intelligence testing, definite procedure, explicit test items, countable and scorable behaviors, but this procedural definiteness enshrouded in definitional mystery, from Binet forward a never-ending series of feeble, wandering verbal statements of what the items and the behaviors are all about.

Some twenty years later, Thorndike et al. review *The Measurement of Intelligence* and we see the paradox developed over time. The instruments have gotten better; the definitional mystery persists:

"Existing instruments (for measuring intellect) represent enormous improvements over what was available twenty years ago, but three fundamental defects remain. Just what they measure is not known; how far it is proper to add, subtract, multiply, divide, and compute ratios with the measures obtained is not known; just what the measures obtained signify concerning intellect is not known. We may refer to these defects in order as ambiguity in content, arbitrariness in units, and ambiguity in significance" (Thorndike, Bregman, Cobb, and Woodyard, 1927, p. 1).

Exactly the same overall review of intelligence testing might be written in 1974. If one reviews the situation persisting from Binet through Thorndike to the present, we find that we have in some astonishing way managed to continuously upgrade a technology for directing an uncertain measurement paradigm towards an undefined entity. If we doubt ourselves in this, then we are bolstered up by the fact that society accepts our work. Intelligence testing "sells". How can this be?

It seems to me that the question of how we got into intelligence testing . . . and, today, how we are to get out of it . . . can only be understood if we understand the social surrounds of the discipline of Psychology. The term "intelligence" has had a social importance that transcends our scientific definition of it. The practice of intelligence testing has had a social usage that has transcended our ability to demonstrate adequacy of measurement or predictive validity.

The notion of intelligence has transcended questions of definition and proof. It endures on a pinnacle of value awaiting proof. In all the manifold writings about intelligence there is a curious resemblance to the medieval proofs of God. Hundreds strive to define or measure its ineffable essence, sometimes with epic labors such as those of Piaget and Guilford. Who sancified intelligence, made it thus prior to proof? The likelihood is that Herbert Spencer gave the term "intelligence" ideological sanctification. The likelihood is that, subsequently, changing American social practices at the turn of the century wove in intelligence testing as part of a new set of procedures for assigning social status.

One hundred odd years ago, Herbert Spencer stated that the be-all and end-all of human evolution was the growth of intelligence, sentience, elaborated knowledge of the world. He argues that, if one arranges the phylogenetic tree in the way we usually do, with natural history moving towards man and culminating in man, then the basic dimension of phylogenesis is intelligence. To evolve is to become more intelligent; to become more intelligent is to evolve. He embedded that argument in a social cosmology, explaining that the best arrangement of men within a society and of one society vis a vis other societies is one in which gradations of intelligence form the basis of the hierarchy. Spencer's evolutionary writing were, on the one hand, enormously persuasive to the early psychologists and most of our contemporary world—views in Psychology have important ancestral debts to Spencerian conceptions. But, more to the point here, Spencer had a simply enormous vogue as the prophet of a scientific, evolutionary vision of the design of a society. Galton preached an individual eugenics. Spencer preached a social eugenics, a society governed by fitness and rewarding and promoting fitness. Read Hofstadter's *The Rise of Social Darwinism*. In the 1870's and 1880's Herbert Spencer's writings were so dominant in discussions of society and politics that they virtually sank into the unconscious of American political deliberation, ceased to be an argument, became obvious, became "common sense". They remain strong even to this day. They form the core of the market mentality satirized in the recent bestseller, *Nixon Agonistes*.

People approached the social changes of the turn of the century with their minds formed by Spencer and the Social Darwinists. Before Binet or Thorndike or Cattell or even Galton they had made up their mind about the centrality of intelligence as the epitome of human merit. When the tests came along, they were not required to prove their way . . . as, indeed, they could not then and they cannot now prove their way. They were exemplifications, definitions, manifestations, of an entity whose scientific and social sanctity was given.

We have rehearsed, very briefly, the ideology of the time. Now consider the import of that ideology into the social business of the turn of the century. American society at the turn of the century was in the process of constructing more egalitarian arrangements. The actors on the American scene . . . aristocrats, workers, Anarchists, immigrants . . . were in search of new rules and procedures for the allocation of social benefits and social status. Not relinquishing the idea of aristocracy, because they believed deeply in the idea that there are better men and worse men, they yet sought to get rid of status favoritism based on inheritance or land or property. They felt that the only right and fair aristocracy should be an aristocracy of merit. To a society concerned to find ways that the best might rule, Social Darwinism offered the extremely important definition of bestness. Bestness was intelligence. Bestness was developed by education. (One must recall that Spencer did not speak of intelligence as solely an innately fixed trait. Spencer saw schools and, more generally, cognitive development as adding to and enlarging human intelligence. Thus, the Spencer arguments were important factors in the several enhancements of the place of education in the social scene at that time . . . the coming of common schooling, the elaborations of colleges to become universities, the general feeling that social science and social scientists must take a more central role in social governance. John Dewey, in his writings near the turn of the century, expresses the almost mystical Progressive feeling prevalent at that time to the effect that science, education, good government, public morality, all interpenetrate so that to foster one is to foster all the others.)

The argument is that the intelligence test exploded into public acceptability and public use not because of its merits but because it could be seized upon as part of a more fair and more just system of social contracts. The test could be used as part of the system for allocating social opportunity. Needless to say, the test could not have been so accepted if the people in power at that time saw the tests as potentially doing them or their children out of power. But the IQ tests of that time had the rather happy property of being a conservative social innovation. They could be perceived as justifying the richness of the rich and the poverty of the poor at that time; they legitimized the existing social order. At the same time, they could play a slowly subversive role so that some of the actors of that time . . . the Germans and the Irish and the Italian and the Jewish immigrants . . . could see their second- and third-generation offspring move towards social status.

All this being true, if it is, how do we get out of it? How do we cease, as Psychologists, being the priests of the mysteries of intelligence, rationalizing a semi-mystical system of social allocation whose present defects have begun to seriously outweigh any benefits gained from previous use? I believe it is now time for us to construct some new testing in place of traditional IQ and achievement testing and that everything . . . new ideology, new social contracts, new data . . . is coming into place to permit us to attempt this. Briefly:

We are in an active period in the rebuilding of the social contracts. This is, I believe, the deeper meaning of the Poverty Programs of the 1960's and the continuing ferment that continues today with regard to education, health care, family assistance, day care, etc. The bargains struck near the turn of the century are beginning to need reconsideration.

There is a new ideology afoot. The old sacred trinity of IQ, school achievement, SES is under fire. We are into the politics of pluralism. No longer one IQ, one kind of human merit, one hierarchy of ability and talent, one way to be Chosen. No longer one monolithic educational system, one kind of school achievement. The present vision is of diverse kinds of education directed towards the diverse activities and ecologies of American work and American life. And, finally, no longer the conception of one SES, one hierarchical society, but a complex society of diverse social orders, diverse status hierarchies, diverse ways to find a niche and make a social contribution.

Our data does not tell us one order, one linear arrangement of human ability prevails. Our test data tells us that humans have diverse, correlationally distinct abilities. Our data from cognitive development, from psychoneurology, from human learning and memory studies, tell us that humans have multiple knowledge systems, multiple systems of representation, multiple gnostic centers, multiple short-term and long-term memories, multiple laws of learning.

We need now to use our data to create a new kind of testing for human merit, a pluralistic kind of testing, in which we seek to make not one statement about a child's ability and talent but multiple statements. I believe we can. We must, because willy-nilly society will keep on using our old procedures for determining bestness until we can provide it with new definitions and procedures. The important psychological work of the near future will be differentiative. We will participate in the elaboration of more complex and more adequate certifications of merit, education, and social place.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Professor White, you made a statement of particular interest, when you said that you had come to the point where you were very skeptical of efforts to evaluate objectively most of the kinds of Government programs that you had discussed in your report.

I wonder if you could elaborate a little on that problem, because on our subcommittee in the House, we certainly have found this to be a continuing dilemma; namely, how do we make assessments that are rational, objective, and intellectually honest, on the effectiveness of Federal human services programs? How are we doing in respect to developing a science of evaluation of human behavior, which, I take it, is the general problem to which you are addressing yourself here?

Mr. WHITE. Well, how are we doing? That is an interesting question. We cannot develop a science of evaluation unless we have behind it some kind of knowledge residing in the behavioral and social sciences, because all that is expressed in evaluation, really, is our ability to make objective estimations of how well the child is developing, how well the family is doing, how well the community is operating, and so forth.

The biggest problem in doing evaluations is the problem of making objective estimations of status at a given point in time. The basic problem is to place a number on a child's forehead, for example, and get general agreement that that number stands for something real, some significant issue about him.

Now, you can take intelligence testing as a kind of test case for our ability to place numbers on children. The question is whether everyone in our society ought to believe that the number we assign to a child via an intelligence test is really a basic definition of what we in the ordinary English language and general social commerce believe to be human intelligence or brightness or smartness.

There has been an enormous amount of discussion about intelligence. Most of that discussion has related about the question of whether children are doomed at birth or not. It is the oldest fate-versus-circumstance argument transposed into the heredity-versus-environment argument in IQ tests.

But I think you should go behind the argument of whether or not IQ is hereditary. Go back to the beginning and say, "Why do we think we are measuring intelligence?" Go back to the people who have been constructing intelligence tests from the beginning of the century forward. You find out that the history leads one to be a little skeptical that intelligence tests measure what ordinary people would generally regard as human intelligence.

There is no question they provide an estimation. There is no question they provide, on some kind of approximate statistical basis, a number that corresponds to what most people think of as intelligence. But only parts of it. And only to some degree, and only approximately.

The other test case with which I am familiar is the Westinghouse evaluation of Head Start. I was a consultant to that evaluation. At the end of the evaluation I defended it publicly. I thought it was a good evaluation. And ever since that evaluation was completed, I have sort of gone around and around on the question of what that evaluation did, what the issues were, and so forth. There was a question that arose. It was a question that seemed a little odd to me at the time.

Some people said, when the evaluation was put out, "That is not a real evaluation of the program. That is not what we passed the legislation for. That is not what we were trying to create Head Start for."

So from the years between the creation of that evaluation, between 1969 and now, it has been my hobby to go around and ask various people who were involved, either at the Washington level or other levels, what exactly did you think you were doing when you got Head Start passed?

Now, I am more and more persuaded that Head Start was not passed in order to raise the IQ's of preschool children. I am more and more persuaded that many people favored Head Start for reasons that had nothing to do with the evaluation, had nothing immediately to do with the evaluation of school achievement and IQ.

Yet, the Westinghouse evaluation centered entirely on whether or not the program improved, in the short run, school achievement and IQ. Why did it center on those? Well, it is analogous to the body count problem in Vietnam. They were the only things that we knew how to count objectively, the only kinds of numbers we knew how to make that were objective registrations of the program.

If you take the other issues that I believe were involved in the passage of Head Start, not only were they not evaluated in that evaluation, but it is my judgment that we now don't know how to evaluate them.

It is my judgment we cannot manufacture uncontroversial data about them.

Well, am I saying programs should not be evaluated? No, everything in this world gets evaluated. Any decision to do something or not to do something implies evaluation. If you ask yourself how schools are run, how preschools are run, you see that what happens today is that combinations of evidence and human judgment are involved.

Now, when I did this report, we had two volumes full of evidence. In order to write the third volume, which had some recommendations in it, I inevitably had to mix judgment with evidence. When you mix judgment with evidence, controversy comes in. You cannot sort of hold it up to a man's nose and say, "Whether or not you want to believe it, here are the facts, and you have to believe them."

Well, I believe that is our fate, and I believe it is our fate for some time to come. I do not think we are going to stop making evidence. I just think we ought to stop this delusion that the evidence we make, because it is the only evidence we are able to make, constitutes all the evidence that needs to be thought about, all of the issues that need to be regarded.

Therefore, I believe that fully objective evaluations are impracticable now. If you were to ask me to estimate, you know, on the basis of what I know as a psychologist about what we know about how to estimate child development, when we will be able to derive the numbers, I would say we are a good distance away. I would say that not for decades, not for many, many years will we know how to put numbers on these things. And even then I am not really sure we will be able to evaluate programs, because there are practical difficulties out there.

You cannot put kids in a box. You run a program. You want to test the effectiveness of the program eight years from now, and the children move away. There may be issues that, even after we know how to put the numbers on, we will have trouble evaluating in a practical sense.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, I appreciate that response.

I might just make an observation or two on what you have said. One of the reasons I happen to be such a strong supporter of the National Institute of Education is precisely that I do not think we know as much as we ought to know when we make judgments about policy in the field of education. A second observation I would make is that the need for more knowledge than we currently have can be used, as I am sure you are aware, Dr. White, as an excuse for doing nothing.

I recall some years ago your colleague, Sam Messick, of Educational Testing Service, discussing before the Select Education Subcommittee what I believe he called evaluative research. That is to say, one embarks upon a program using whatever knowledge and judgment he has, but at the outset makes the judgment that the most careful evaluations possible will be made of that program in order to learn from it.

I take it you would not disagree with either of these points that I have made?

Mr. WHITE. Not at all.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Because of other preoccupations, I have not had an opportunity to read your entire report, but I will tell you that I am going to try. After having looked at your summary I find, if you will allow me to say so, a kind of thread of contradiction running through it, not unlike the one that I have just spoken to, and to which you addressed yourself. On the one hand you say we really do not know as much as we ought to know. However you have also told us that we have to be very careful about embarking on this effort or that.

For example, to quote your report, you say—

> Research is needed to more definitely understand the potential and present effects of day care on children.
>
> In its absence, substantial investment in developmental day care appears inadvisable.

That is the end of the quote. I realize the significance, perhaps, of the word "substantial." But, on the other hand, you say also in your report, to quote, "that a system of day care facilities including centers, homes, places in private centers, homemaker services and other facilities as outlined in the support section be organized to deal with the needs of children from unsupervised, inadequately supervised, crisis, and stress situations, as needed."

I realize there are some qualifications in that recommendation. I hope you will not regard it as simply cavilling if I suggest that there seems to be a degree of contradiction there. On the one hand you say, well, we really do not know enough to do anything. However, later in your report you say, here is what we ought to be doing.

I could cite you similar apparent contradictions running throughout your entire summary, as I am sure you are aware. Could you comment?

Mr. WHITE. Yes. On the particular contradiction you are mentioning, we were much concerned at the time we did the report on a difference which was discussed a great deal then, but not discussed much now. The difference between so-called custodial versus development care.

There is an argument. Some people regard day care primarily as assistance to families. Other people regard day care primarily as a device to get the child away from the family and do something that the family cannot do for the child; that is, develop the child in some way.

Now, this is not to say that I believe you ought to just throw the the evidence for augmentations of basic care for the child, which would develop the child in some way. We found the evidence so slender, we found the support for the proposition so thin that we recommended against it. And we were not careful about our language because, to many people, developmental day care means good day care. That is not what we meant.

We meant the difference between good day care and day care that tries to provide, let us say, an exceedingly high level of activity, cognative or social development. We meant the difference between running a preschool or good day care center at ages 3 to 5.

Now, this is not to say that I believe that you ought to just throw the kids into a room and not do anything to stimulate them, that adults should not be with them trying to interest them and teach them.

I was trying, in that report, to discriminate between spending a great deal of money to get people with, let us say, teaching credentials and spending not a great deal but some money in order to provide for educational components, as opposed to, let us say, using the money to distribute more service to families by providing more care for children.

So it was a question of concentration of resources, and I realize that that contradiction has to be explained. But I do not believe it represents a contradiction in my own thinking.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, I appreciate that and I am reminded of the example you gave earlier about the Westinghouse evaluation, which, as I recall made the front page of the New York Times in what I thought was one of the most sloppily written, inaccurate, outrageous pieces of journalism I have seen in some time. I will give you one suggestion: if you would like to know what the authors of legislation had in mind when you are developing an evaluation of that legislation, you might ask them. As one of those who was involved in the development of Head Start, I must say, nobody from Westinghouse ever called on me, or, to my knowledge, any of my colleagues. We could have told you and saved whoever was involved in it a great deal of money at the outset by saying never did we have in mind that Head Start should be regarded as a solely cognitive program in purpose.

So, for you and whoever else was involved in the Westinghouse evaluation to come back and respond to us solely in terms of cognitive development, we could have said at the outset was a moot response. It really is not relevant, or at least not fully relevant, because obviously we are interested in more than that.

Before I turn to another question, Professor White, I do want to express my strong agreement with you on how much more we have to do than we are presently doing to improve our understanding of human behavior from a scientific viewpoint, and to develop as fully as we can some science of evaluation. That is very important for politicians, so that we know what it is as best we can that we are doing.

Second, I note that in your report you recommend what you describe as two thematic emphases for the near future: (1) individualizing services and (2) working with the family, rather than around it.

Now, you have looked at our bill, I take it. I wonder if you could comment on the extent to which you feel that the proposed child and family services bill moves in the directions of those two emphases. We would welcome any suggestions you might have for changing it, if you do not think that it is responsive to those points.

Mr. WHITE. I do not have suggestions about changing it. I must say that when I first saw the bill I was just plain delighted with it. I felt that the bill, both with regard to these thematic issues and in many other ways worked in the kind of spirit of what I saw in the report. It is very hard to take a sort of large complicated picture, only slowly forming in your mind, and make a small set of recommendations, you know, sort of principles or slogans.

Those thematic recommendations I thought about a great deal since. I think they still make sense, as kind of centerpieces of effort. What I see when I read the bill is the deliberate attempt to build in a variety of issues of disadvantage. The deliberate effort to read in, let us say, disadvantage in childhood, more than simply poverty, ethnicity, more than simply family weakness; but all of these things together.

I see in the bill an attempt to build local councils or local groups that have flexibility, that can make differentiated allocations to problems as opposed to dealing with all problems in a stereotyped way.

I see in the bill consumerism. That is, some attempt to give the families power. Some attempt to give them choices. Some people argue that local people do not know how to handle power, do not know how to handle choice. I do not believe that. I believe if they do not know at the beginning, they learn how to handle it.

I think all of this goes in the direction of both individualizing services and working with the family.

As far as the basic emphasis on working mothers and on providing day care, there is no question in my mind that we are in a situation in which families have to have help with their kids to some extent to prevent fostering, to some extent to prevent abuse and neglect. And I think that the bill is, in my mind, completely consistent with those two principles.

And, what is more important to me, with the picture I have of the problem, the picture I have been trying to present in my testimony.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Well, that is a very helpful response, I must say, Dr. White, after you have made this study of Federal programs for young children. I take it you are saying that the child and family services bill moves in the kinds of directions that your studies indicate we should be moving in terms of public policy?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I am.

Mr. **Brademas.** Another point that you made in your report had to do with implementing screening programs for young children. I wonder if you could expand on that point for a moment?

Mr. **White.** Well, I have gotten a little nervous about that, and I worded my testimony a little carefully about that. And I would like to go back and be very sure about what was said and what was not said.

There is enough evidence to suggest to me strongly that a number of handicapping conditions in childhood arise in the preschool years, and if not fixed in the preschool years will cause problems for the rest of the child's life.

So I am persuaded in general that it is important to try to find those problems and to try to fix them. But, having said that, I think you have to say a little bit more. There is a great danger in unleashing screening in the early years when you are not very sure about your diagnostic techniques. There are constant risks to screening for problems when diagnostic techniques are unsure. You create a lot of false positives and, of course, you create false negatives. But the false positives induce a kind of tyranny, a kind of tyranny of the screener, a kind of tyranny of the system.

So the way I stated it in my testimony is the way I think one should try to proceed. We will be trying to find new ways to identify early handicap in childhood. As we find them, trying to diagnose and treat as early as we can. I think that it is a very hard problem. I am told to establish that a 3-year-old is deaf. It is very clear that if a 3-year-old is deaf he needs a definite kind of treatment or there is going to be a language difficulty for the rest of his life.

Well, I do not want to unleash a lot of people who are going to run around and sort of falsely diagnose kids as deaf and create problems for the families.

Similarly it is a difficult problem sometimes to detect whether marginal retardation exists. And it is a terrible blow to both the child and the family to make the statement to the family that the child is retarded.

So I do feel, I did recommend in the report, that it is very important to try to have early screening. But I am a little worried right now sitting here about the state of the art. I think this is one of those cases where research and implementation are going to have to work very closely together, hand in hand.

Mr. **Brademas.** Well, thank you very much, Professor White. If I could make a generalization or two about what you have said, you have warned us of the need for a degree of humility in making sweeping judgments about the impact of programs in this area.

But, at the same time, I take it that you are saying we should not pull everything to a screeching halt because we are so steeped in ignorance that we can do nothing.

You have also suggested a number of constructive directions in which you think we ought to be moving, and you have suggested that the proposal that Senator Mondale and I and some others have introduced moves in those directions. Would that be a fair summary of what you have said to us?

Mr. **White.** Yes, it would.

Mr. Brademas. Well, thank you very much. There are many other questions that I would like to put to you, but we must turn to some other witnesses as well.

Thank you very much, Professor White.

Our next witness is Dr. Bettye Caldwell, professor of education at the University of Arkansas, and director of the Center for Early Development and Learning, at Little Rock, Ark.

Dr. Caldwell, we are glad to see you again before this subcommittee. We look forward to hearing what you have to say.

STATEMENT OF DR. BETTYE CALDWELL, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS; DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR EARLY DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Dr. Caldwell. Thank you very much, Congressman Brademas, and other distinguished staff members of the joint committees.

It is an honor for me to be here today to meet with this group and speak in behalf of your plans to submit to the Congress your separate versions of the "Child and Family Services Act of 1974."

As one who followed closely the earlier efforts of dedicated members of these committees to formulate and pass legislation designed to help families provide needed services for their children, I experienced vicariously your own disappointments at seeing these efforts meet with frustration. I am grateful to you for your perseverance and your wisdom in reactivating this issue of concern to all citizens of our country and urge you to persist until your efforts are successful.

It is interesting to reflect on the fact that we manage to pass legislation dealing with child abuse, with drug abuse, and that we must constantly increase appropriations designed to combat juvenile delinquency and crime—crisis situations that are inordinately resistant to remediation—but we have difficulty with legislation which could truly hope to be preventive and have a long-term salutary influence on the society as a whole.

The kinds of services called for in the bills under discussion today are catalytic services, each of which can be expected to have a multiplier effect throughout society.

Furthermore, I humbly believe, and we just spoke about the aspect of humility, that we know more about how to operate the kinds of programs families need and want to help prevent problems than we do about how to correct serious problems once they surface.

Therefore, it is my fervent hope that we can enact laws that will fund social programs in which we have a respectable degree of operational competence and from which a positive return to individual families and the entire society can be expected.

Let me comment just briefly about the need for such legislation. And there is no need to belabor the obvious, because you, Mr. Brademas, have talked about it extensively. And in his formal introduction of the bill, Mr. Mondale reviewed some of the major statistics which mandate some national effort to help families and children. And it is interesting, by the time you state a set of figures in this area, they are already obsolete, and the magnitude of need is even a little greater than it seemed to be the day before.

But even more relevant, perhaps, for the need to supportive legislation than such facts as the number of mothers who work, the number of mothers of preschool children who need day care and so on, is the fact that between one-eighth and one-seventh of our children are growing up in single-parent families, obviously mothers in the great majority of cases.

In such situations, the typical pattern is that the mother must either work, often at a low-paying job, or else must receive direct societal support for her dependent children.

In the vast majority of these situations, poverty either lives with the family or is a close neighbor. Conspicuously absent as neighbors are other family members—that is, the extended family, which has been part of our traditional support system for your parents for generations, is virtually disappearing. This means that many young families cope with the problems and difficulties associated with the upbringing of children in virtual isolation from others who could conceivably help them. Many parents have expressed these feelings of isolation and loneliness.

No matter how much we might like to sentimentalize about it, life for many families is not a continual reenactment of a Norman Rockwell painting of Thanksgiving dinner; often the table is almost bare, or, even when it is not, there might not be many family members with whom the feast can be shared and enjoyed.

The families of America have been trying to express these needs for help in many ways. Once a decade we have in this country a conference dedicated to identifying the needs of children and planning programs which will meet those needs. In the 1970 White House Conference on Children, this need surfaced in some form in almost every forum and, when delegates voted on issues of overriding concern, it moved to the top of the list. That is, the issue identified as the most urgent and the most in need of attention in our country at that time was: "Comprehensive family-oriented child development programs including health services, day care, and early childhood education." That need, recognized in 1970, is just as valid today if not more so.

At the end of a White House conference, both exalted and exhausted by the experience of participatory democracy, one feels optimistic when consensus of a large and diverse group is finally reached. One thinks that surely the necessary legislative and fiscal support needed to mount such programs is but a step away. And indeed it seemed to be that way, during the exhilarating year of 1971 during which your committees shepherded enabling legislation through the Congress.

But the exhilaration disappeared with the veto which ignored the needs and focused only on the putative flaws in the bills. I would submit that the new versions amply provide the safeguards of family decisionmaking about which people were concerned earlier and in addition call for more efficient administrative structures.

The carefully selected cross-section of American citizens who comprised the 1970 White House conference delegates have a right to ask if we will have to wait until the 1980 conference—and reminds us that we are halfway there—before we move to try to implement the kinds of programs visualized by the 1970 conference delegates as necessary for America's children?

If not, delegates appointed in 1980 might simply ask, "Why bother? Perhaps nothing will come of it anyway." Diligent efforts to secure passage of these 1974 Child and Family Service Acts would move us forward to the point where, by 1980, we should have developed the necessary competence in program operation and administration and monitored programs long enough to be able to point definitively to their salutary effects on America's children and families.

Now I should like to comment on specific aspects of the planned legislation, relating these comments to my own experiences in developing and implementing child development services over the past decade.

I do this not because I have any expertise in legislation, per se, but because certain sections of the bills provide the perfect vehicle for commenting on the general need for the kinds of services described.

First, I would like to comment on the title. The semantic shift involved in the title of the new bills is an important one, and the proposed label does a better job of characterizing the groups to be served. Although I am such an admirer of the Head Start concept that I do not wish to say anything that could be construed as negative, the name of the program does carry the connotation that it is for children. Anyone familiar with the Head Start program operation knows that there is always a strong parent component both in policymaking and in services provided; nonetheless, its title sounds as though it is a children's program.

The same kind of labeling effect exists in relation to the public schools. One of the goals of every creative school program is to involve parents, and notice, I said creative school programs, in the total process; in fact, the schools are operated by duly elected board members.

Yet the label we have used makes it sound as though the schools are for the pupils, and parents can sometimes be made to feel like intruders. The title of the new bills makes it clear that we are talking about services for children and families, and the titles given to the national and local councils which are to oversee program operation will reinforce the intent to define the services in such a way as to include families. Although I personally could never find any ambiguity in the old legislation, there is certainly none in the present version.

Next, I would like to comment on the importance of program diversity. And I feel this is nicely called for in the bills. In planning a national program which will be "provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services" it is essential that diverse patterns of service be offered. In the past several years you have heard testimony from professionals who know how to offer one particular pattern of service, who perhaps believe in one particular pattern of service, and then from parents and community representatives who want perhaps one particular kind of service.

Having followed the deliberations of the committees as closely as I could, I know that you have heard from people who have advocated group day care and people who have condemned group day care.

I sat here and heard such deliberations. You have heard from people who have claimed that home tutoring provides the answer to our problems and from people who rebut that home tutoring will not significantly help the family with a working mother; from people who have said that programs must begin in infancy and from others who have said that the infancy period must be inviolate; from people who have said that early childhood education is the only answer to our large-scale educational problems and from people who have told you that it doesn't work.

Of course, all of us are like the six blind men groping to understand the essence of the elephant; we are all a little bit right and a little bit ignorant. And also a little bit confused.

But, in all fairness to the professionals in the field, it is difficult not to be confused when funding for carefully evaluated programs has been short-term and piecemeal.

And I would disagree in certain significant ways with Professor White. I do believe we can evaluate.

Just as a group trying to test out the effectiveness of some particular idea has solved most of the implementation and training problems that interfere with efficiency of operations, funding is likely to be terminated. It is not easy to advance our substantive knowledge of what can be expected from different types of programs under such circumstances, and we must have long-term followup of these programs. We cannot know the effects within a 2- to 3-year period.

But, fortunately, parents are likely to be less confused than the professionals—they know what they want and what they need. And they need all of these services that I have described, and the right to choose from among them.

Parents are also more realistic about considering available alternatives. A working mother—let us say a single parent—might listen with interest to a debate about whether it is better for a child—perhaps as measured by some obscure test of which she never heard—to be in day care or to remain at home with his mother. But she knows that is not the choice available to her. For her the choice is quality day care in a group or in an individual setting, which she wants if she can find it and afford it, or poor day care, which she may be forced to use if no other kind is available.

One of the reasons we must have diversity of programs is because the needs of families shift from time to time. If we opt for just one form of service, we will not only be unable to meet the needs of all families at any given time but also unable to meet the needs of the same family from one time to another. For example, we speak of "material employment" as though it were for any given mother a continuous state of affairs. But there are jobs of shorter and longer duration, and there are employees who decide to change jobs but might have open times between.

I have known of situations in which mothers who were "between jobs" withheld this information from the day care center attended by their children because the center served "only children whose mothers work full time."

She didn't want to lose her place, and knew she would need the service again.

Thus, an interlude in which the mother and children could have been at home together was forfeited because of a rigid service pattern which perhaps because of program guidelines, could not be made flexible enough to adapt to the changing needs of families.

In the context of concern for program diversity, I think it is important to mention that we must not forget the importance of having some programs geared to the interests and needs of fathers as well as mothers. Please do not interpret that as a suggestion from me that the interests of fathers and mothers with respect to their family roles be all that different.

Nevertheless, it is easy to drift into a vocabulary that is all female. Thus, as the bill states, along with "services to expectant mothers who cannot afford such services" and "post partum and other medical services to recent mothers," I would hope that there will be services to fathers, expectant and otherwise, and informational programs which remind us all that fathers also play a vital role in the development of their children. It would be a mistake to overlook this as we plan for program diversity. Appended to my statement are a few letters from parents commenting on their reactions to our public school-university-Federal grant cooperative child development program, called the Kramer project, that we have been operating in Little Rock for the past 5 years.

Several of these letters are from fathers, and one of them touches especially upon this point and the impact of such a service on both the father and the mother as well as on the total family unit. I have changed the quote only to take out names. And it sounds perhaps a little awkward, but substitute names for words like "mother" and "daughter."

I want to quote from that letter.

> A special feature of Kramer is the involvement of the staff with the families of the children in the center. We were able to know our daughter's teacher personally and always felt that we had input into what happened in her classroom. The teachers seemed genuinely interested in the parents and more than willing to gain information about their feelings about the program and about their children's development.
>
> Even more important than what Kramer has contributed to our daughter's development or what positive effects it has had on my wife and me as individuals, however, is the effect it has had on our family as a unit. By being available, by being free, and by being a quality program, Kramer allowed the family to make a much desired move and allowed me to change professions. My wife and I felt good about what was happening to our little girl at school and happy about our move and happy about the change in jobs. His chain of good feelings would have broken quickly without the quality program which you and your staff maintain. The program was there when we most needed an outside support for our family. I really don't think these changes could have been made with any peace of mind without the Kramer project.

[End of the letter.]

Next, I would like to address some remarks to the assurance of quality programs, and I think that this is an aspect, there are several places in the proposed bill where you deal with this, and I consider it most important, the maintenance of quality in programs initiated under this act.

In his introductory statement, Senator Mondale quoted the former Director of the Office of Child Development as having said that OCD was in some instances "paying for service that is harmful to children." That is the last thing we want to accomplish with any new legislation, and I commend the committees for building in safeguards that help to protect against this.

Although I do not like her metaphor, I am going to quote once again from one of the letters recently received from one of the Kramer parents:

> As a working mother of two preschoolers, I have a definite need for day care. But day care, as frequently revealed, is often nothing more than a low-class "kennel for children."

That is the metaphor I do not like, and I think it is a slight exaggeration. But perhaps I have had a better opportunity to see quality day care and less opportunity to see some of the more inadequate ones. She goes on to say:

> Most day care centers simply aim to keep a child off the street, out of the supervisor's hair, and quiet. They do not attempt to teach anything, or stimulate a child's interest in the world around him. This type of program is for the benefit of the adults, not the children.

Then, reassuringly, she goes on to say:

> My children's experiences at Kramer has been beneficial for both them and me. The children receive more motivation at school than they could at home, because all personnel are on hand to stimulate the children and help them want to learn. This learning includes grammar, motor ability, and most important, awareness. The children are constantly reminded that all people have feelings, just as they do themselves. They are taught to respect these feelings in other people just as they do in themselves. There is really no way to express the importance of the Kramer program in my family. It has made such a dramatic difference in the development of my girls that I feel truly sympathetic for all the children who have not had the opportunity to participate in this unique program.

You will forgive that slight bit of creating a halo there, but I did not want her letter to suggest that all day care needed to be like a "kennel for children."

Both the House and Senate versions of the bills have provisions for monitoring and insuring quality control, and this is essential if we are to avoid developing programs that can harm children. One of the things I have learned the hard way, over the last 10 years of work in this field, is that it is a lot more difficult to implement a quality program than it is to design one on paper. We always worry, justifiably, when we try to move outward from small, high-quality, carefully monitored and evaluated programs to mass programs.

Therefore, I like the idea that the program called for in these bills begins a bit cautiously, enlarging as experience is gained, and that the bills make provision for staff training, for program monitoring, and for involving universities in research activities that relate to program outcomes. But undoubtedly, one of the major guarantors of quality is the requirement that at least half of the members of the Child and Family Service Policy Councils be parents of children served in the programs. As is clear from even the brief excerpts of statements I have read from parents, more than any other group they have a vested interest in seeing to it that quality is maintained in any operational program.

Next, I would like to comment on the importance of coordinating programs developed under these acts with other child and family services.

And because of time limitations I shall comment on only one more specific aspect of the proposed bills. The authors of the bills deserve special commendation for encouraging coordination between and among various groups offering services to children and families. In relation to my own work, which has involved continuity of program operation from the early childhood period through at least the elementary years, I was especially pleased to find in both bills a provision for programs designed to extend child and family service gains—particularly parent participation—into kindergarten and early primary grades, in cooperation with local educational activities.

To me this is one of the most important aspects of any new program for young children and families to make absolutely certain that programs developed under the proposed legislation do not compete with existing programs for family support, or for fiscal support, for that matter, and do not arrogate unto themselves alone the right to wave the banner of child development services.

This past Friday in Boston I participated in a panel discussion that was part of a symposium sponsored by the Early Childhood Task Forces of the Education Commission of the States. Our assignment was to discuss ways that public schools could mobilize for the delivery of child development services, including services to families and prefamilies. There are those who would assert that the bureaucracy of the public schools renders them insensitive to the needs of children and resentful of my intrusion of families into the operation of the schools.

But my important point here is this does not need to be the case, as various people who spoke last Friday made quite clear. It is indeed possible to avoid that kind of depersonalization and bureaucracy, and it is obvious from the statements from my parents that I read that they did not have that reaction to the services offered in Kramer, and a public school.

Incidentally, one of the comments we most frequently received from parents with children in our program is their appreciation of the fact that our services are available to all their children; they do not have to deliver three different children to three different programs, each of which specializes in a particular age group. Developmental continuity is not only sound conceptually, but it is convenient for parents in a very practical sense.

Personally I would like to see stronger steps taken to ensure coordination of programs operated under the auspices of this legislation and other programs already in the communities serving as prime sponsors. This might take the form of specifying that some of the seats on the child and family services policy committees be reserved for personnel from the local school districts, and from various health and social service programs. Even with the new programs made possible by these acts, there would still not be enough service to go around; and the last thing we want to set up is a situation in which competition between and among agencies could occur.

Now, if I may briefly summarize my comments, and perhaps broaden out and get a bit philosophical here. This is a very conflicting time in the public life of our great Nation. There are those who would maintain that the public conflict causes some of our personal difficulties and others who maintain that the public anguish merely mirrors the personal conflicts. I am not one to offer any resolution of this ongoing national debate. I refer to it only because of its relevancy to the difficult history of these important pieces of proposed legislation and to their prospective rites of passage through the full legislative machinery.

How, on August 8, 1974, can acts that deal with the development of programs for children and families get their fair share of congressional and public attention? Who has time to write to his or her Congressman or Senator about these bills when there are other issues, seemingly so pressing, that demand our attention and that of our representatives? And why should we work for passage of legislation about which there might not be national consensus?

Opponents of the earlier versions of the bills claimed that they had family-weakening provisions and possibly represented an invasion of the domain of the family. No one, least of all the sponsors of these bills or persons likely to speak in this forum in their behalf, wants to weaken the family or invade its domain. Yet between the defeat of the old legislation and the preparation of these new acts, several officially sanctioned steps have been taken which recognize that sometimes a nurturant society must take direct action on behalf of its children.

Examples of this are the creation of a national center on child abuse and neglect and the development within OCD of a child advocacy program. A Nation such as ours which values individual family autonomy does not take such steps lightly but cannot refrain from taking them in the light of evidence of occasional shocking unmet needs of children.

I should like to close by commenting that the bills prepared by your committees are healing and reparative measures which can minimize the necessity of our ever having to take more drastic steps to protect the rights of our children. By creating a mechanism through which families, young and old, can get the services they need to support them in crisis periods and to cooperate with them in noncrisis periods in which they simply need help, we should gradually obviate the necessity of ever having to take more direct intervention on behalf of children.

Thus, as a citizen I approve of your efforts to help bring our programmatic efforts for children and families more into line with our verbal commitment which often has the ring of hollow rhetoric when evaluated by fiscal standards. As a professional in the child and family service field, I endorse the careful planning that has gone into the preparation of these bills to make certain that they meet the needs of families and children in today's world. And as a parent, I applaud the wisdom of legislative groups that recognize that a government which is insensitive to the needs of young children and their families cannot hope to help create the kind of society in which growth is easy or maturity enjoyable.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Dr. Caldwell, for a statement that reflects not only your considerable experience and knowledge in this field, but very great care in its preparation.

Before putting a couple of questions to you, I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert in the record the text of the article to which I believe you made reference from the Washington Post of August 8, 1974. The article deals with the number of families headed by women in the United States.

[The article referred to follows:]

[Excerpt from the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1974]

More Women Run Families

10 PERCENT OF POPULATION LIVES IN FEMALE-HEADED UNITS

(By Peter Milius, staff writer)

The number of families headed by women in the United States increased by more than a million in the last three years—as much as in the preceding 10, the Census Bureau said yesterday.

The bureau, in the first full report it has published on this problem-ridden and growing population subgroup, said one-tenth of all Americans now live in female-headed families, almost one-seventh of all children under 18 and almost one-third of all blacks in the country.

Nearly 40 percent of these 21.3 million people are poor as the government defines poverty—and these people make up fully a third of all poor people in the country. They account for more than half of the black poor. Black and white together, they are probably the largest identifiable group of poor people in the nation.

There were 4.5 million families in the country headed by women in 1960, 5.6 million in 1970. The bureau said there were 6.6 million in 1973, 12 percent of all families, 10 percent of all white families and 35 percent of black.

"This very rapid increase over the last several years," the bureau said, "has fostered a growing concern among social scientists and government planners regarding changes in family structure and composition.

"Much has been written, usually speculative in nature, about the general breakdown of family living arrangements in the United States. Theories range from the position that a basic transformation . . . is occurring to the position that recent changes are only momentary and the structure of the nuclear family, as we now know it, will be maintained."

The bureau offered various possible explanations for these changes. "High rates of marital dissolution through divorce and separation certainly have had an impact," it said.

"But there has also been an increase in the number of female heads of families who are single, which may be due in part to the retention of illegitimate children by their mothers and also to the liberalization of adoption procedures whereby single persons may now adopt children."

"Another important factor," the bureau's experts said in their report, "is the increased participation of women in the labor force," which has "led to increased economic independence among many women."

"Other factors possibly related," the bureau said, "are the increased availability of public assistance . . . as well as the changing attitude toward independent living among women today."

The rise of the female-headed family has been most pronounced among blacks. Nearly 40 percent of all black children now live in such families. Since 1960, the total of all families in the country has gone up 21 percent, the number of black female-headed families, 92 percent.

The bureau said a rising percentage of women who head families are young, divorced and separated or single, and a declining percentage are middle-aged and widowed. More than half these women work, about a third of their families depend entirely on earnings for their incomes, and only about 11 percent depend entirely on welfare or social security for income.

Median income of female-headed families is only about half the national median. In 1972 it was $5,342 for all female-headed families, $6,213 for white and $3,840 for black. The poverty cutoff, according to the government, is now about $4,500 a year for a family of four.

Mr. **Brademas.** Just two questions, Dr. Caldwell. You indicated that you had some disagreement with the comments on the subject of evaluation made by Dr. White.

Dr. **Caldwell.** Yes. I think one problem is that we get hung up on the idea of finding a score that represents the gain or the loss or something of that sort. Measurements sometimes consist of counting. That is the most fundamental type of measurement, and it is a very scientific type of measurement. And I think it is an easy matter to articulate objectives for these programs, just as you said was done at the time the Head Start legislation was written almost 10 years ago. And then the type of evaluation that we want is in the form of determining whether, indeed, these things are occurring.

For example, one can specify kinds of skills that you want children to acquire if you are talking about a group or a home tutoring program.

All right, one type of evaluation is a simple count of how many children acquire these skills as a consequence of the kind of program that you have offered. There are also various ways of getting at parent reactions. I think what we have to do is, as Dr. White mentioned, modify a lot of our thinking about what is acceptable evaluation. But I certainly don't think we want to give up evaluating. Rather, what I think we want to give up is a few of our sacred cow-type scores that we have hung onto and realize that these are evaluating perhaps irrelevant things in relation to the program goals that we have articulated.

Mr. **Brademas.** Well, I probably would be ill-advised to try to speak for Dr. White. But in view of your response, I don't sense any wide area of disagreement with you on that point.

My other question has to do with one of the problems to which you also made reference in your testimony. You mentioned that opponents of the comprehensive child development bill of 1971 alleged that day-care services can weaken parent-child relationships. As you are aware, and indicated in your testimony, we have sought to shape our bills to maximize involvement of parents and to increase their role in the decisionmaking process with respect to the planning and operation of the programs.

I understand, Dr. Caldwell, that you have done some studies to measure the effect of your program on parent-child ties. I wonder if you could comment.

Dr. **Caldwell.** Yes. We found that there was no difference between the type of attachment formed by the child for his or her mother when the child had been in day care and when the child had been reared totally at home with his own mother. There are two or three other studies that point to that finding now. There is one that is contradictory and there are no more than five pieces of research that I know of in this area. So by no means are the data all in. But the evidence is strongly on the side of the fact that this can occur.

One thing that seems to me to cause some of this hangup, and that is really all it is, is that when some of the early talk about this bill came up years ago, Mr. Brademas, people began to evaluate in terms of what we know about children reared in institutions. Children who are reared in institutions are totally different. They don't have families who come to see them, they don't have daily reunions, they don't have an opportunity to share experiences. Sometimes they don't know who they are, have a name and so on. And I think personally that this is what got us off into that misleading kind of association.

And the kinds of services you are calling for in this bill are not in any way related to the kinds where children do not have continuing family ties. I think the best answer is for fathers to reflect on it.

Mr. Brademas. I take it, Dr. Caldwell, from your testimony, that you do endorse the Child and Family Services bill?

Dr. Caldwell. I endorse it heartily.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, indeed.

Senator Stafford?

Senator Stafford. Thank you. I have no questions for Dr. Caldwell. I do appreciate your appearance here and your statement which will be very helpful to us. I am glad that you have concluded by stating your support for the pending legislation in front of the committee.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. Lehman?

Mr. Lehman. No questions. I just appreciate your testimony. Thank you for coming.

Mr. Brademas. Senator Taft?

Senator Taft. I have no questions. Thank you.

Mr. Brademas. Dr. Caldwell, thank you very much indeed, once again, for having given us the benefit of your thinking.

The Chair will now recognize the Senator from Vermont who will present the next witness.

Senator Stafford. Thank you very much.

This Senator would invite, in behalf of the subcommittee, Patricia Jewett of Vermont, to become a witness.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to introduce Patricia Jewett to you as a native Vermonter and here as a witness before this subcommittee.

Patricia is the President of Vermont Child Care "76". She is the campaign executive director, and she is with Champlain Valley Family Development Corporation.

I look forward, and I am sure all of this subcommittee does, to the testimony which she will now present to us.

Miss Jewett?

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA JEWETT, PRESIDENT, VERMONT CHILD CARE "76" CAMPAIGN; EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CORP., BURLINGTON, VT.

Miss Jewett. Mr. Brademas——

Mr. Brademas. The Chair might just say how pleased we are to have you here. I am sure that you, as a Vermonter, must take some pride in the report in this morning's newspaper that your distinguished junior Senator has been suggested as among those who might be a Vice President of the United States.

Miss Jewett. We certainly do.

Mr. Brademas, Senator Stafford and members of the committee, I am very pleased to be able to be here to talk with you from my own personal experience about the needs of families of children in Vermont, although I do not think that the needs of these families and children differ too much from families and children across the United States.

Just a little bit about my background.

I have been in Head Start in Vermont since the summer of 1966. I worked there with the 4C program. I think that I presently have seniority in the State of Vermont in terms of working in the field in Head Start and day care.

I am also presently Chairperson for the New England Head Start Directors Association, and am coordinating the Day Care and Child Development Council of America's "76" Campaign for the New England region, as well as for Vermont.

Senator STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if I could intercede here very briefly.

Patricia, it might be desirable for you to have your entire statement placed verbatim in the record of this committee's hearing at the conclusion of your testimony.

Then, in the interest of time, because we know that you have an airplane to catch, if you summarized it for the committee rather than reading the entire text, if that is agreeable with you and the rest of the subcommittee.

I suggest we proceed on that line.

Miss JEWETT. Surely.

Briefly, I would just like to make a quick statement about what I see as some of the minimum needs of families and children from my own experience.

I think there needs to be an availability of what I term comprehensive day care services. When I use the word "comprehensive," I mean including medical, dental, mental health, nutritional and social services, as well as an educational component.

I think there needs to be reasonable alternatives, and Dr. Caldwell has spoken to that certainly. I think also, in talking about day care, we need to give some thought to before and after school care, as well as to preschool care. There is a great deal of discussion about preschool age children, and we sometimes forget what happens to the 6, 7, 8, 9-year olders whose mothers are working.

I think there needs to be early childhood education experiences for all children with special problems, and I defined those problems more fully in my paper.

I think that there needs to be a much wider availability and accessibility to health services. This is a particular problem in Vermont.

I think that medicaid has helped. I think that the early periodic screening diagnosis and treatment services should be available to all families and children, and not just to medicaid eligible children.

There needs to be support for families in trouble. There needs to be an assurance that there are minimum standards for all children who are in care subsidized by state and Federal moneys.

There needs to be maximum involvement of parents in the decision making regarding programs for their children. And I will comment upon that more fully later.

I think there needs to be a wide availability of parent effectiveness training. And, finally, I think there needs to be availability of these services based not on income.

I think that many people today would say these are minimum services. I think that before we are going to have even those minimum services, we have to have some major decisions or major commitments from our policy makers, both at the state and local levels. And that is that we are going to start looking at programs in relation to the needs of children and their families, and not in terms of other needs.

I think once that the commitment is made, it will make a great deal of difference in how we shape our programs.

One of the biggest problems that we have in Vermont is the shape of our title 4A program. Title 4A moneys support not only in Vermont, but across the country, the largest child care program other than Head Start. And yet, in many places in Vermont and in other places, I am sure, title 4A does not serve children. It is primarily a support for working parents. And the result is, then, that there are no guidelines which require a comprehensive range of services be offered, such as is the case in Head Start.

The result, then, is a large number of children who are receiving little more than custodial care. And very often this is not because the people providing the care believe that this should be the case.

It is because the reimbursement rate for title 4A to various facilities providing day care is so low that it is impossible to provide a comprehensive range of services. This problem can be seen by comparing the average payment for day care in Vermont during the month of June 1974 with the average cost per month of service to a Head Start child.

The average payment for all facilities in June was $74.50 per child, while the average payment for center care was $96 per child.

During the past year, the average cost per child in my own Head Start program was $133 per month.

Based upon my knowledge of other Head Start programs in Vermont, I would hazard a guess that this is probably the lowest average in the State, $133.

Thus, what has happened in some, though clearly not all cases in Vermont where Head Start and title 4A funded children have been served in the same center, is discrimination in provision of services based upon the funding source.

If you are a Head Start child, you receive medical and dental services and any mental health services you may need.

If you are a day care child, you may go without those services because the reimbursement rate will not cover that. That situation has improved somewhat with the expansion of medicaid to include dental services. But it clearly does not cover all services.

It is possible to commingle Head Start and title 4A funds to provide comprehensive services to all children.

However, this takes some administrative skill and knowledge in fiscal planning, which few local center directors seem to have. This leads to another problem that I feel is utterly crucial and which we seem to, at the local level, get caught in time and time again, and that is coordination.

Everybody believes in it, I think. But not very many of us seem to know what to do to bring it about.

One of the most pressing problems we have in terms of coordination is in the variability in income guidelines for programs. There is an income guideline for Head Start; there is one for title 4A; there is one for medicaid, and for many of the other services, so that it is possible for a family to be eligible for one service and not another service.

I think that all of the income guidelines should be based upon net and not gross income, as Head Start guidelines are presently now based upon. It is only real income that is meaningful to families of four.

Second, I think that all the income guidelines should be based as much as possible upon the economic situation in local areas.

In a State like Vermont, for example, where AFDC payments are fairly high, it is often better to live on welfare than to work, especially since welfare families are also eligible for food stamps and medicaid.

This often creates hard feelings between welfare recipients and low income working poor who are struggling to survive because they believe that they should work for a living. But they do not see the same benefits accruing to their families.

I am not meaning to imply here that welfare payments should be reduced. What I mean is that the same kind of benefits should be available to low income families who are making the same income but working.

And we get into some very hard feelings and very extensive areas where we have many, many families in Vermont who are $500, $1,000, $2,000 above the income guidelines for Head Start, who see many families on welfare who are eligible. And the Head Start guidelines at this point are ridiculous, at least in terms of families in Vermont.

It is practically impossible to live on $4,320 gross income for a family of four.

The Head Start guidelines have increased only $1,320 in the last 6 years. This problem is further compounded because the system has no sliding fee scales.

In Vermont you are either eligible for medicaid and food stamps or you are not. And if your income rises above the guidelines, the monitoring is so careful now that you can be dropped within a month.

At this point, families who have had food stamps, who have had medicaid, who may have gotten a raise in their pay which put them just enough above the income to lose their medicaid and food stamps, may be worse off than they were before they got the raise because they now no longer have that kind of support.

And the system then creates situations in which families must make real choices as to whether to stay on welfare rather than to take a fairly good paying job, or whether to continue working after they receive a raise.

A reasonable sliding fee scale that helped families become self-sufficient over a period of time would help alleviate this problem a great deal. It would also bring a large population of middle and lower middle income families into the mainstream of services which are now inaccessible to them.

It is these families who make too much money from guideline points of view to qualify for services, but who make too little money to pay the full cost who are suffering in this stage of severe economic pressures.

These are the families whose children are not receiving medical and dental and mental health services. And these are the families where the mothers are going increasingly out to work and need some partial subsidization for their child care services.

These families, as well as low income families, really need the support of child and family services today. And it is these families we have increasingly on our waiting list in Head Start who become increasingly angry because their "too high" income make them ineligible.

I think, unfortunately, one of the things we experience, it is always those of us in the field working directly with these people and never the lawmakers who pass the laws who have to say no to families and then try to explain to them why they are not eligible when we very often cannot rationalize anything more than the fact that it is the law.

I think it is crucial in this time, when we are considering planning a new program, that we really look at the programs that are already in existence, and how any new law is going to affect the new programs.

Again that coordination.

One of the quickest examples that comes to mind is the 10 percent guideline for Head Start which requires that 10 percent of our spaces be reserved for handicapped children. I think the guideline in itself is very positive in that it gave access to many children to a system that they did not have access to before.

However, we in the field get caught in the crunch between State laws which are being passed, which have certain requirements, and certain jurisdictions over special ed, and a Federal program that we are working with which puts certain requirements upon us.

And so, therefore, very often, rather than looking at the children and the child's family and what he really needs we end up trying to meet someone else's performance standards or guidelines.

And, again, one of the experiences we had in Burlington was with the Follow Through program, which supposedly was funded in any community based upon the requirement that there was a full year Head Start program.

However, the Follow Through program guidelines were written and the program was administered by the Office of Education, while Head Start was administered by OEO.

And, very often, the people who were giving technical assistance to the Follow Through program were unfamiliar with Head Start guidelines, had never read them. And we got caught in the crunches, families got caught in the crunches between the Head Start and Follow Through.

In Burlington, because of the particular system that was there in the Head Start program, or the Follow Through program, was in one school district, so that although all of the Head Start children in the city of Burlington were supposedly eligible to go into Follow Through, they could only go into Follow Through if they lived in the particular school district where the Follow Through program is located, or if they wanted to provide transportation out of their own local neighborhood.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Miss Jewett, I wonder if you will let me interrupt you with this point, to ask you a couple of questions, because I must go to another meeting and would not otherwise have an opportunity to do so.

First, I would like to thank you for your carefully prepared statement. I think it is especially useful to hear from someone who has had experience in the field of administering programs for younger children, and who can, therefore, indicate where the problems are, such as the income guidelines question and the coordination among the several programs issue to which you have just made reference.

I just have two or three quick questions.

One, do you perceive from your experience in Vermont, and in the New England area in general, demand for the kinds of services that are proposed to be made available under this legislation?

Miss JEWETT. Yes, sir.

Simply, yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In that connection what would you say about the argument that I have heard on a number of occasions against legislation of this kind, namely that the provision of day care and other services by the Federal Government is unwise, because doing so would have the effect of driving women out of their homes to work?

What is your comment on that often expressed allegation?

Miss JEWETT. I have been running day care centers for the last 6 years. And we don't ever go into someone's home and try to convince them to go out to work so that we can fill the centers.

Women are going out to work, and women need a place to put their children.

And one of the requirements of the Head Start program, which we have simply carried over into our day care program, is that the parents become involved. And though it is a different kind of involvement for a working mother, because she obviously is not leaving work to volunteer in the center, I think that in terms of the policymaking, in terms of her caring about her children, it has been a tremendous support for her.

I can think of a mother who has had her child in one of our day care centers since the child was 3. She just went into the public school system last year. She can tell you some wonderful stories about babysitters, of babysitter after babysitter that she went through and some of the horrendous things that happened to her children before she put her child in this center.

And it was such a relief to her to know that her children were in a safe place, that they would be happy and healthy, that it made her work experience much greater.

She was a single parent, a divorced parent, with five children. She had to work.

So I think that people are coming to us. And parents want to know that their children are safe. This does not mean just center care. It can mean individual home care or small group home care.

But mothers need to know that if they are out working, their children have a safe place.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do I take it, Miss Jewett, that you endorse this legislation?

Miss JEWETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Senator Taft?

Senator TAFT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Miss Jewett, I was particularly interested in your problems that you indicated between the regulations that you run into with regard to State supervision and then the dual role of the Federal agencies involved.

There are probably some other ones, too, that you did not mention.

Do you think that we are necessarily on the right track as to the approach that we are making in supporting these kinds of services?

In other words, one question that arises in my mind, certainly, is whether or not we wouldn't do better merely to provide the financial backing involved, directing the State, and allow the State to concentrate its efforts through, hopefully, one agency or one supervisory facility for all the problems that are involved.

Do you see any particular advantage?

We could do research and education here. I don't say that that should be stopped, but I wonder from the point of view of administration, whether it might not be preferable to look to some kind of unitary approach to this problem.

Miss Jewett. I guess I have mixed feelings about that. I certainly think there needs to be a uniform approach.

I think there needs to be some wired coordination. I am not ready yet to say I think all the money should be funneled through the State, because I think there is certainly, in Vermont at this point, a lack of coordination among the State programs themselves.

And just to funnel the money for these services through the State is not going to necessarily solve the problem.

I think we have been able to do many, many positive things in Head Start that we might not have been able to do had the money come through the State.

I think one of the most positive things about Head Start is the local councils which require local parent participation. There has to be some kind of dual cooperation.

Senator Taft. There is nothing to prevent a State from putting in a requirement of that sort.

Miss Jewett. There is nothing to prevent them, no.

I do think that all of the programs need to be coordinated in one way or another. I am not convinced that that necessarily means all of the money has to flow through one system.

Senator Taft. Setting up prime sponsors as this legislation does, applying for and getting their funds directly from the Department here would not seem to be to be a step in the direction you are talking about, unless you wipe out all the other programs, which I do not think you intend to do.

Miss Jewett. Or unless you require in the proposal application that there is some indication that the services at the local level and the people involved in those services have sat down and talked together and put together some kind of a mutual plan.

Senator Taft. Vermont seems to me, being the tight little State that it is, that this would be a place where you would welcome being able to get it all together in one place and knowing who is in charge and whether the rules are for everybody.

Miss Jewett. Well, as I say, I have mixed feelings.

It is not all together at the State level.

Senator Taft. Thank you very much.

Those are the only questions that I have.

Mr. Lehman. Thank you, Senator Taft.

Would you like to continue?

Miss **Jewett**. I would like to make a couple of comments on the end. I would like to make a couple of comments on the problem of rural child care and something that I have seen happen in the past 2 or 3 years is a great trend toward what is called the home base program or home start, or in-home care. And I think that that kind of program has some real value.

On the other hand, from my experience in working primarily in child care in the rural area, I would just say a word of caution about this.

The biggest problem which we have, the highest expense which we have in our program, is transportation. And as I pointed out here, many of our centers cover three or four towns. And our Head Start transportation routes may take 1½ to 2 hours.

And a child who is only 5 miles one way of the Head Start route can cost up to $500 or $600 extra over a period of a year, which may mean that in the long run we cannot take that child into the program.

Those are very often the children who need the program the most. They are the farthest away from the center; they are the farthest away from other people. They may come from the most deprived families.

I think, because of the high cost of the transportation and because of the increasingly high cost to maintain buildings and even to find buildings that will meet licensing regulations, people are more and more turning to a home base type program.

My caution is that I found that one of the biggest needs of our families in rural areas is for social experience for the families as well as for the children.

But for the children particularly, they need experiences in groups. They need to work with other children. They may make as many cognitive gains in the home with the parent who understands the educational process. I am not sure that a parent and two children or three children can ever really substitute for the group social experience that 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old experiences in a center.

We also find that this is one of the biggest needs for our parents in the rural areas. I sometimes think we have had as good luck with our parent participation in the rural areas because it is the only time many of them ever get together with anybody else. And this is a very rewarding experience for them.

And I am always struck when we say, well, you are doing the educational kinds of things with your parents. And people say, well, after two or three meetings and they get over their need for social experiences. And I do not know why we say only a social experience is not valuable.

It seems to be all right for upper- and middle-income people to get out and socialize all we want to, but if low income parents in a center just need a social experience there is something wrong because we are not providing something beyond for education.

And I think that my feeling about the alternative is I would like a program and their families to choose a home base model because they feel it is the best program for them, not because it is cheaper, because there are not enough funds to take care of the transportation costs.

So if we are talking about viable alternatives, we have to have viable alternatives and money enough to support those so that we are not just making choices based on a cheaper kind of model.

I would like to say something about I am excited about the provision in the bill for the parent councils. I think that it crucial. I think it has been one of the best parts of Head Start, one of the weakest parts of title 4A day care program because there is no requirement in title 4A that the parents be involved.

The one thing I would caution initially is that the role of the boards be very clearly spelled out. I think that there are a number of kinds of Head Start participation for parents.

There is participation in volunteering in the classroom, and that level of involvement. And then there is the policymaking one. We have gotten caught in the crunch in Head Start very often because the guidelines are not clear, the administrators are not clear.

What is the difference between a policymaking role and day-to-day administration in the center? And I think that when you get the day-to-day administration combined with policymaking you get a crunch between the staff and the parents about who has final jurisdiction. That is not positive.

When you have clearly spelled out that it is a policymaking role, it is a policymaking role, then it is an extremely positive role for parents. And this to me has been probably the most rewarding experience I have had over the past 5, 6 years in my Head Start program.

Our program is 800 miles from the Canadian border, halfway down the State. And our parents have to travel anywhere from 60 to 75 miles to get to a policy council meeting. And many people will say, well, nobody is going to travel that far for any meeting.

In the 4 years that we have had a policy council we have had at any one time a minimum of 18 parents on the committee. We have had no more than three meetings in which we have not had a quorum, because those parents know that they are truly making decisions that involve their children. And they ask good questions, they take responsibility. And that is the positive thing about the program. And I think they must be involved in any program which involves their children.

I would like to say a word about training. There is a good deal of training money provided in the bill. And I think training money is badly needed. I think we need to look very carefully to whom and how training contracts are awarded.

One of the biggest problems we have in New England is seeing training contracts go to institutions and training contractors who get large overhead and large salaries, and who ultimately provide very little in positive training. And I think that there are many people in the field with experience. I think we need to look very carefully at what we are doing with our training money.

I think in terms of setting standards that that is also a crucial area. I think we have to do much more than set standards. We have to assure that there are going to be qualified personnel to monitor.

In Head Start we have a lovely set of performance standards. We have been asked to write component plans as to how we are meeting those performance standards. As of yet I do not feel there really are an adequate number of personnel to really monitor and tell whether we are meeting those performance standards or not.

And sometimes I think my program has the reputation it has because I am able to write, not based upon anything anybody has seen. And that is certainly a very unfortunate way to judge any program.

Mr. LEHMAN. Miss Jewett, I wonder if you could wrap it up now, because we have one other witness, and we will have a quorum call in about 15 minutes?

We appreciate your testimony, but I want to try to get it all in today.

Miss JEWETT. Sure. I thank you very much.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you for your very valuable testimony. I am sure it will be of great interest to the other members of the committee when they have a chance to look at it.

[The prepared statement of Miss Jewett follows:]

TESTIMONY OF PATRICIA A. JEWETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, BURLINGTON, VT.

Senator Mondale, Representative Brademas and members of the Senate Sub-Committee on Children and Youth, and House Select Committee on Education, I am very pleased to be able to talk with you today about the needs of families and children, in general, and in Vermont, in particular. My name is Pat Jewett and I am presently Executive Director of the Champlain Valley Family Development Corporation in Burlington, Vermont, which is a delegate agency of the Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity whose primary responsibility is to administer the Head Start program in the four northwestern counties in Vermont. We presently have 9 centers which service 210 Head Start children and 40 day care children, subsidized by Title IV–A. I have worked in Vermont in Head Start and Day Care since the summer of 1966 and have now, I believe, seniority in the state of Vermont in working in Day Care and Head Start programs in the field. In addition, I am presently Chairperson for the New England Head Start Directors Association and am coordinating the Day Care and Child Development Council of America's public education campaign, Child Care '76, for the New England region. Therefore, though I am here to speak today, primarily to the needs of children and families in Vermont, my perspective is somewhat broader.

What are the needs of children and their families in America today, for the basic needs of Vermont's families do not differ greatly from other families? At a minimum there needs to be:

(1) Availability of comprehensive including medical, dental, mental health, nutritional services, and social services as well as an educational component, day care services for all families who are working with some reasonable alternative for parents to choose from. This includes before-and-after school care, as well as care for pre-school children.

(2) Early childhood education experiences for all children who need them due to such problems as handicapping conditions, developmental disabilities, emotional disturbance, early deprivation and environmental lags, and for prevention of abuse and neglect. This latter may simply mean an opportunity for a young mother to have relief from one or more of her pre-school age children for a few hours every day.

(3) Proper and early detection and treatement of health problems. Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis Treatment Services should be available for all children not just medicaid-eligible children and general access to good health care (including medical, dental, nutritional and mental health services.

(4) Maximum support for families in "trouble" (marriage counseling, mental health services, employment counseling, counseling in child-rearing to prevent abuse, etc.).

(5) Assurance that there are minimum standards for all children who are in the care of the state or in care subsidized by the state or federal government. (This implies, of course, adequate monitoring and evaluation, as well as just the presence of minimum standards.)

(6) Maximum involvement of parents in decision-making re: programs for their children.

(7) Wide availability of Parent Effectiveness Training.

(8) Availability of all these services regardless of income level.

How then, are these needs reflected in public policy-making?

Although I see these services as minimal, I believe that they require some maximum decisions on the part of our policy-makers at the national and state levels: There must be a basic commitment not only to the philosophy that our children really are our most important natural resource and that families are the most important single influence upon their children, but also, that the majority of American families cannot service today with the economic pressures upon them without some major support services. One indication of the latter is the clear fact that the extended family, with one or more relatives available to help share in child-rearing is no longer the norm. In fact, a large number of children are being raised by a single head of household. In 1970, in Vermont, there were 156,-796 children under the age of 18. 14,865 or 9% were in a home with a single head of household. And certainly with rising inflation, more and more women will have to go out to work in order to "make ends meet". In 1970 41.2% married women were working and 29.6% of married women with children under the age of 6 were working, to say nothing of the single female head of households.

Once such a commitment is really made, it is then important to plan and shape programs around the needs of children and their families, rather than around other needs. The biggest single example of a program serving children, yet not based upon their needs, is Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. Except for Head Start programs, this program provides the greatest amount of money available nationally for subsidizing child care programs. And yet, in many places, Title IV-A day care does not really service children, but is provided primarily as a support service for working parents. There are no guidelines which require that a comprehensive range of services be offered, such as is the case in Head Start. The result, then, is a large number of children who are receiving little more than custodial care often, however, this is not due to lack of good will on the part of the provider, but the fact that the reimbursement rate is so low that it is impossible to provide any extra services.

This problem can be seen by comparing the average payment for day care in Vermont during the month of June, 1974 with the average cost/month of service to a Head Start child. The average payment for all facilities in June was $74.50/child while the average payment for centercare was $96.00/child. During the past year the average cost per child/month in my Head Start program was $133, and based upon my knowledge of the other programs in Vermont, I would guess that that is the lowest average in the State. Thus, what has happened in some, though clearly not all cases in Vermont where Head Start and Title IV-A funded children have been serviced in the same center, is discriminative in provision of services based upon funding source. Head Start children are provided with comprehensive medical and dental care and/other needed services while day care children go without such services because the reimbursement rate does not cover the cost. This situation has improved somewhat with the expansion of Medicaid to include dental services, but this clearly does not cover all children. And it is clearly possible to "commingle" Head Start and Title IV-A funds to provide comprehensive services for all children. However, this takes some administrative skill and knowledge of fiscal planning which few local center directors seem to have.

This leads to another problem which, I believe, is crucial in any future planning which is done for additional programs for families and children at any level, and that is "Coordination", that wonderful word that everybody believes in, but few people seem to know how to accomplish. Again, I do not believe real coordination can be accomplished until everyone involved is clearly committed first and foremost, to serving children and their families rather than to using children's services to support other primary goals as is now the case in Title IV-A.

However, one area in which it does seem possible and I feel, crucial, to begin to develop some uniformity is in the area of eligibility guidelines. At the present time it is almost impossible to really keep track of who is eligible for what services. It is possible, in Vermont, for example to be eligible for Title IV-A and Medicaid services but not to be eligible for Head Start.

All income guidelines should be based upon net, rather than gross income. It is only real income which is meaningful to families today, especially low and middle income families. Secondly, all the income guidelines should be adapted to the economic situation in local areas, not just some. In a state like Vermont, for example, where ANFC payments are fairly high, it is often better to live on welfare than to work, especially since welfare families are also eligible for food stamps and medicaid. This often creates hard feelings between welfare recipients and the low-income working poor who are struggling to survive because they believe they should work for a living, but do not see the same benefits accruing to their families. This problem is particularly sensitive to those families who are only a few hundred or a few thousand dollars above the income guidelines for these programs, especially for Head Start.

This problem is further compounded by a system which has no sliding fee scales. This is especially true in Vermont for the Medicaid and Food Stamp program. You are either eligible or you are not. And programs are monitored carefully enough so that within a month or two after the rise in income, medicaid coverage or food stamps may be dropped; and if the raise was only just enough to put the family slightly above the guidelines, they may end up worse off than they were before they got the raise. This is a ridiculous system in a country which ostensibly believes in supporting the concept of self-sufficiency. The system as it now operates creates situations in which families must make real choices as to whether to stay on welfare rather than to take a fairly good paying job, or whether to continue working after they receive a raise in pay. A reasonable sliding fee scale in which families could become gradually self-supporting would help to alleviate these problems. It would also bring a large population—the middle and lower-middle income families into the mainstream of services which are now inaccessible to them. It is these families—who make too much (!!) money to qualify for services but who make too little to pay for the full cost—who are suffering in this stage of severe economic pressures. These are the families whose children are not receiving medical and dental care and mental health services. And these are the families where the mothers are going increasingly out to work and need some partial subsidization for their child care services. These families, as well as low-income families really need the support of child and family services today. It is these families we have increasingly on our waiting list, in Head Start today, who become increasingly angry because their "too high incomes" make them ineligible.

Unfortunately, it is those of use in the field, working directly with the people and rarely ever the policy-makers at the state and national levels who have to say "No" to people whom we know need services badly and who have to explain the reason behind guidelines for which we see little of no rationale.

Another area in which it is crucial that some real planning and coordination be done is in comparing guidelines for federal programs with existing state laws. One example comes to mind in the Head Start guidelines which mandated that 10% of the spaces in our Head Start programs be reserved for handicapped children. Although this was a positive move in that it guaranteed access to the system at an early age, many states are now implementing Special Education laws which overlap with the Head Start mandate and it is often not clear who has final jurisdiction. The guidelines need to be flexible enough so that priorities are clearly to service the children and families before meeting reporting requirements or performance standards.

Another problem which should be eliminated is the approval and funding of two programs which are mutually dependent upon one another but administered by two separate agencies, unless there is clearly demonstrated mutual planning and development of guidelines at the national and regional as well as at the local level. Such a case was the administrative of the Follow-Through program which was funded on the basis of an accompanying Head Start program in the local community. Though Follow-Through was dependent upon the Head Start program, guidelines for the program were developed by the Office of Education and consultants giving technical assistance to Follow-Through were often unaware of Head Start guidelines and policies and so make it difficult for there to be a Follow-Through to Head Start. Although all Head Start children were supposedly eligible to attend the Follow-Through program in Burlington, due to the nature of the Burlington school system coupled with the fact that the Follow-Through program was located for a number of years in one school district, many children who had attended Head Start, could not attend Follow-Through because they did not live in the proper school district unless they were able to provide their own transportation. This problem, among many others, should have been solved *before* the program was funded.

Finally, I would like to address some of the areas which are addressed more specifically in the Child and Family Services Bill: provision for alternative methods of child care, parent involvement, training, and setting of standards:

(1) PROVISION FOR ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF CHILD CARE

This problem is a particularly real one in a rural area like the state of Vermont. The single largest problem which faces us is our transportation cost. For the past three (3) years, more than 10% of our Head Start budget has gone toward transportation, and this still is not enough. Our centers often cover three or four towns, and our bus routes are sometimes an hour and a half long. However, nearly always the children who need the program the most, who are the most isolated, who come from the most deprived families, live the farthest away from the bus route. And often, we have to turn away these children because the cost of transportation is so high. "But the child is only five (5) miles off the bus route." True. However, at the present time we contract with a local transportation company for $.35/mile. At 5 miles×.35×4 times/day, the cost is an additional $3.15/day×5=$15.75/wk.×36 weeks=$567/year. For even 3 or 4 children in this situation the extra cost becomes prohibitive. Thus, faced with severe transportation problems, often coupled with difficulties in locating space which will meet licensing standards without costly repairs, many programs are now turning to "home-based" programs as the panacea to the problem of rural child care. This concept is appealing to many people because it is less costly, eliminates the need for costly buildings, and transportation and most importantly reinforces the concept that parents are the primary teachers. All of this is true. And though I believe strongly in involvement of the parent in the learning of his child, I would offer some words of caution before seizing upon this approach as the best answer.

One of the basic needs of children and families in rural areas is for social experiences. One of the greatest deprivations which rural children experience is that of isolation. And one of the greatest benefits from a center experience is that of working and playing with his peers, learning to be a part of a group, sharing, talking (language development is a great problem in our rural children). And, I believe mothers can become as involved in the learning experience of their children by volunteering in the center as through home visitors. Plus, this experience can easily be reinforced by Teachers and Home-School Coordinators in their home visits. And, the social experience for parents while working in, and making policies for a center program is also very valuable for our rural parents.

I am not suggesting, by any means, that a home-based program is not a valuable one, nor that it is not a viable alternative. What I am doing is raising some questions, based on my own personal experience at a time when home-based programs are quickly becoming, "the thing to do". But more importantly, I am suggesting that home-based programs should be chosen because they have been deemed to meet the most needs of the families which they are serving at any particular time, rather than because they are a more inexpensive alternative. If this is to be the case, then, there must be adequate funds available to meet rising costs of transportation and high costs of building renovations, rental and maintenance, so that choices are made on the basis of human and program needs, rather than on monetary limitations.

b) *Parent Involvement*: Parent involvement is a very important element and I am excited about the requirement for parent councils. However, I would point out that the role of the Boards and Committees should be a policy-making one and not an administrative one, nor should the two be mixed as they are in Head Start. When Boards and Committees become involved in the day-to-day details of the administration of the programs, a great deal of confusion results as to who is ultimately responsible, and it is only the children who suffer. The guidelines should be clearly written and then there should be adequate training for the Committees clearly delineating their role of administration. If this is done from the outset, there will be much smoother running programs.

c) *Training*. The availability of training monies is a tremendous asset and badly needed especially in day care centers. However, the administration of these training monies should be carefully reviewed to assure that the money is really benefiting those it was meant to benefit. It has often been our experience in Region I in the Head Start program that vast amounts of training monies go into overhead and salaries for contractors who have little or no real skill or knowledge in the areas in which they are supposed to train. Head Start staff often know more than do the trainers, and very little money is often available for actual training sessions. The contracting system for training grants should be closely examined.

Secondly, I believe that much more emphasis should be placed upon training in administration and management. I think that one of the single greatest problems which faces all social service programs at all levels is the lack of good management skills and a lack of understanding of human service administration. The first step to alleviating this problem is to recognize that administration is a field of its own and not a career development position. That is, the best teachers do not usually make the best directors, nor do the best social workers make the best supervisors. There is a whole different set of skills involved ranging from fiscal management and planning to personnel management and supervisory skills. When we begin to provide some real meaningful training and technical assistance in this field, I am sure we will begin to see a higher quality of service and more efficiently run programs.

d) *Setting of Standards.* Although this is a crucial area, it is only the first step toward assuring quality. The more important step is providing for an ongoing system of monitoring and evaluation with qualified personnel available to give training and technical assistance. Setting standards is not enough. Nor is it enough to ask programs to write plans to meet the standards. There must be on-going, on-site visits to programs to see what is actually happening, so that programs do not get evaluated solely on the basis of the writing skills of the director.

I would like to conclude by saying that although there are many poor quality child care services being offered and though there are many other gaps in services, there are many, many very dedicated staff and parents who are already providing excellent services and others who could provide excellent services with a little more money. I would urge you to provide protection for these people in giving them priority for the new funds. That is, there will be many people who will be looking for this money and who will see child care and family services as a good field to enter. Services may tend to "boom" where there have been only a few. Based upon our tragic experience in Vermont with the pilot Family Assistance Program, many of the problems with that program could have been avoided if those of us who had had real experience had been involved from the outset. Instead, rather than first expanding and/or coordinating with already existing programs, new programs sprang up and a Head Start and a Day Care Center located only a few blocks from each other found themselves competing for the same children. This is a great tragedy in a time of heavy demands on limited resources. Although the FAP project could not be considered a success and thus a "model" to be followed, there were many lessons learned which could save many headaches in the implementation of the Child and Family Services Bill.

I thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts with you today and sincerely hope that the opportunity that the Child and Family Services Act raises for a real dialogue and debate across this country will serve as a turning point in our nation toward placing our priorities in funding upon children and their families.

Mr. LEHMAN. The next witness is Dr. David Crane of Indiana. And Chairman Brademas once again asked me to extend his regrets as he just had to make his other meeting. He certainly appreciates the fact that you did take the time to come up here.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAVID G. CRANE, PSYCHIATRIST AND ATTORNEY, MARTINSVILLE, IND.

Mr. CRANE. If it is convenient for the committee, I could come back when you reconvene, in that I do not have a flight out until after 4 o'clock.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is going to be a little difficult. So we can probably be here until about 10 after, when the next quorum call comes. If you could kind of get your statement in there, I am not trying to restrict you.

If there is a quorum call, could the statement continue with the staff? I believe the staff could get all this down into the record.

I will stay until we have a quorum call.

Mr. CRANE. I am Dr. David Crane. I am a psychiatrist and also happen to be an attorney. I was formerly the director of the mental health clinic in Bloomington, Ind.

I come speaking from two areas of expertise, the first being that of a psychiatrist, and the second is that of being a father.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today to raise some questions about, not the political aspects of the impending bill, but some of the philosophical assumptions upon which child development legislation appears to have been based.

By child development legislation, I refer to the sort of legislation vetoed by President Nixon in late 1971, passed by the Senate in 1972, once more, and buried in the House of Representatives, and now resurrected in Mr. Brademas' and Mr. Mondale's, Child and Family Services Act, presently being considered by your committee.

First of all, I think it is fair to suggest that H.R. 15882 is essentially the same as the Child Development Act of 1972, which aroused a great deal of controversy 2 years ago.

To be sure, the phrase "child development" is rarely employed in the bill, and it certainly is not in the title.

Instead, we find the phrase "child services." However, with all due respect to Dr. Caldwell and her comments about the change in title, I see the title as being about as significant to the bill as the headline of a newspaper is to the content of that newspaper.

There is a matter of terminology that is changed, but the substance remains the same. The statements of findings and purposes is basically the same. The present bill starts with the statement that, the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children. And it goes on to maintain that the purpose of the present legislation is to build upon and strengthen the role of the family through programs which will be purely voluntary, and provided, at the request of the family.

As a physician I am a little sensitive to voluntary programs of the Government especially as evidenced by the professional standards review organization amendment which is also considered voluntary unless we doctors do not agree with it, and then it is to be imposed on us involuntary.

Language slightly stronger than that of the 1972 bill and its surface acknowledgement of the role of family. But I suggest that in the end it will be little more than window casings.

I am not going to discuss the technical aspects of this piece of legislation, but I would like to discuss primarily the philosophy of child development.

Despite President Nixon's call in his veto message in 1972, on previous child development legislation for a national debate on the assumptions undergirding the idea, there has in fact been little discussion on it.

In the Capitol Hill debate much energy was expended upon arguments over the mechanics of delivering services. But few have really cared to listen to the case against this philosophy of child rearing.

We are talking about divergent value systems and divergent philosophies. Perhaps most exemplified by the two Senators from New

York who have taken diametrically opposed views of child rearing in this debate.

Senator Javits has stated his position forthrightly and candidly. The care and nurture of young children should be the concern of the State. Senator Buckley, on the other hand, believes that the family should be the social unit, with primary responsibility for the child rearing, and that the State should intervene only when the family has demonstrably failed to meet its obligation.

If the family-oriented school of thought loses the argument on Capitol Hill, so too, will the vast majority of American families who strive to rear their children in an atmosphere of personal attention, love and respect, and not consign them to concessions of strangers whose interests are primarily business.

The programs to be funded under this act are exceedingly comprehensive, as you know much better than I. I am going to focus my remarks to one general area.

In this bill we are not considering simply day care services for working mothers, or mothers who need to work, but might not be able to without such services. Child development experts deprecate that sort of thing as warehousing, and it is not at all what they have in mind with this bill.

Nor are we talking about simply cognitive training, such as reading and writing, which elementary schools used to take care of. No, in this case we are talking precisely about emotional, psychological and physical rearing of children, that which used to be considered the province of the family.

Now, it seems the Government is inserting a very large entering wedge, even though for the time being it is being called voluntary.

I would like to speak now as a psychiatrist about the potential effect upon children psychiatrically of the widespread day care concept of child development programs. Interestingly, and I am sorry Chairman Brademas is no longer here, but to my knowledge he is not a father of children, and yet he is introducing legislation that has a very dramatic effect on children.

There was a symposium very recently written up in one of the psychiatric journals where Dr. John Bowlby probably *the* authority internationally on child development, currently working with the Institute of Human Relations in London and President of International Association for Child Psychiatry, discussed child care centers. The question asked was: Are day care centers, licensed baby nurseries, or other stand-ins for mother as satisfactory from the child's point of view as the genuine article.

His answer was a resounding no.

I am reminded somewhat of the courtroom battle of the experts. We have heard experts testify today who obviously disagree with Dr. Bowlby. But I would suggest that he has credentials which are unimpeachable.

He is convinced that an infant's healthy development requires a continuous intimate relationship with a mother figure which may be supplemented by a few other attachment figures, such as one finds in the extended families.

He continues, "Day care is a rather dangerous procedure which is almost certainly very expensive and very mistaken." In fact, I would suggest that this committee contact Dr. Bowlby for a more thorough description of his views on the subject.

Dr. Mary Ainsworth, Professor of Psychology at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, agrees. She reported a study at Johns Hopkins, and perhaps this is at least one of them to which Dr. Caldwell alluded, where it was found that after just 5 months in a day care center, 20 toddlers, ages 2 to 3, exhibited more signs of anxiety and fear of strangers than had a similar group reared at home.

Nonhuman primate experiments with monkeys, most notably conducted by Dr. Harlow at the University of Wisconsin, tended to similarly confirm the importance of the mother-infant relationship.

Dr. Ainsworth has said many psychologists feel that if an infant's insistence on keeping his mother figure accessible to him proves to be inconvenient then it should be possible to train the infant out of this insistence.

That is an interesting position for the social planners and social experts. But in my opinion that is the height of arrogance. I happened to have examined a client for the State of Michigan who is accused of murdering three persons.

He successfully completed their behavioral conditioning program and was considered by the psychologists in that program as being rehabilitated. They felt he was cured. He had been in institutions from age 14 to age 29. He had never before committeed any aggressive acts.

Upon being cured he left the institution, and is now charged with murdering three people, including a police officer.

This is how we can rely on our psychology experts and psychiatric experts. I do not mean to pick on psychologists in particular.

Dr. Caldwell alluded to the fact that we can evaluate, presumably with some degree of certainty, some of these behaviorial changes. I suggest that we should view that statement with a great deal of caution.

Dr. Ainsworth does go on to say, "we are beginning to realize, however, that this kind of thinking" (namely, being able to change or alter the thinking of the developing infant), "optimistic and welcome as it may be for many, is a distortion of the way nature operates, and that no species, humans included, is infinitely inflexible."

To members of this committee, presumably many of whom have children, and perhaps grandchildren of their own, I would like to show the sensitivity and perceptibility of the infant. I cite again a personal example of my own experience with my eldest son.

At the age of 2 months, and he was a 2-month premature infant, so therefore this was theoretically at the day of his birth, my wife and I engaged in a family argument. And instantly upon the raising of our voices, that child began to cry.

I raise this point to demonstrate that children of early age are remarkably perceptive to many things that are taking place within their environment, and if that environment is changed, it will dramatically change the development of that child.

Dr. Bowlby points out that researchers have a tendency to evaluate individuals without reference to their environment, and therefore come to erroneous conclusions. Many of you may recall how, with your own children, they may have reacted on a trip, as contrasted with how they react at home.

Whether they follow the same schedules definitely affects their behavior often demonstrated by changes in sleep patterns. I suggest that if this is true in your own experience, it tends to practically substantiate what Dr. Bowlby suggests.

Approximately 1 year ago an article appeared in the Indianapolis Star about a local family who had reared a total of 124 foster children. They had 10 or 11 of their own. The father was a blue collar worker. The breakdown was something like 84 boys, and the remainder girls. The vast majority graduated from high school. Not a single one of them had an official police record on their leaving the home.

I suggest that perhaps this family is more of an authority than our psychological experts.

Classic psychoanalytic theory has viewed the provision of food as the major thrust or core of the mother-child relationship. Dr. Bowlby sharply disagrees, as do I. And I would suggest anyone who has seen a child respond to its mother is acutely aware of the relationship, and that it is far more complex than simply the provision of food.

Dr. Bowlby says that it fails to account for the specificity of the systems of the child's tie to the particular woman who mothers him. It also fails to do justice to the complexity of the mother-child interaction.

What that means is the mother-child relationship consists of a great deal more than giving him a bottle, and more than giving him token care. On the basis of studies over the last 20 years of primates—wild animals and primitive human groups—Bowlby concludes that the need for protection is far more fundamental to the strong bond between the young and their mother than is hunger for food.

Again, at a practical level, consider the observations of your own child taking his early spills, and going through the early exploratory anxieties. A mother there to nurture and to love this child, a mother with a fundamental investment, not a third party investment, offers a great deal more to that child from a mother-infant relationship than simply giving him food.

Now, we have a concept called "imprinting" in the field of psychiatry and psychology. This is a concept whereby certain stimuli elicit certain innate behavior patterns during critical or specific periods in the normal development of an animal.

While we cannot duplicate this kind of experimentation in humans, Bowlby definitely feels it is applicable. Accessibility of the mother figure represents a degree of homeostasis in the child's newly developing world.

To be sure, there are significant numbers of mothers who may not have a satisfactory makeup to want to stay home and be "a good mother." And in fact, perhaps in many of these cases, the child could benefit by obtaining its "mothering" elsewhere.

In fact, I believe this is probably one of the major underlying thrusts that allows legislation along the lines of the child development bill to even come into existence. There are mothers who want to get out of the home, not because of financial reasons, but because of emotional reasons.

We hear the suggestion that a mother in a low enough income bracket should have day care facilities available in order that she might work. I suspect, and I do not have anything really to corroborate this, but that if research was really done, it would be found to be significantly cheaper to pay that mother to stay home, than to have her children cared for in a day care center. Another alternative might be to offer another member of the household, tax incentives to allow her to stay home.

It would seem to me that paying one mother to stay home would be cheaper than to pay for the care of three children at a day care center.

This, however, is not really what many mothers want. They do want out. And I contend that this is partly related to the bombardment of the mothers in the home by what I describe to my wife as being her "junk journals." These journals are packed articles telling mothers that "just being a housewife" is an inferior role. I personally contend that there is no higher role that any mother could achieve.

"Clinging to mommy," far from being an undesirable byproduct of being fed, has a protective function for human babies, and animal young alike, according to Dr. Ainsworth.

For example, we find that there are certain people who have what we call latent diabetes. That means they are born with a propensity to develop a certain physical ailment, provided certain external or internal stresses occur during their daily living.

If, however, these stresses do not occur they may never develop diabetes.

I think genetically that individuals are born with similar emotional propensities or vulnerabilities. If in the household, conditions are good, and the stresses are minimized in regard to the child, then development is good.

If, however, considering these genetic tendencies that affect development, the household or environmental aspects are changed or are bad, the child may suffer accordingly.

Developmental anomalies are likely to occur in proportion to the extent that the rearing environment differs from the original "environment of evolutionary adaptiveness," according to Dr. Bowlby. The "environment of evolutionary adaptiveness" essentially means the home.

Dr. Melvin Connor, a Harvard Anthropologist, studied an African bushman tribe where the mothers carried their children in a sling, thereby making mother's breast as constantly accessible as the rhesus monkey's mother's breast is to her young.

Dr. Connor hypothesized that this kind of child care was necessitated by the environment. Do these infants use mother as a security base from which to explore individually? His answer was yes. He found that those children, ages 2 to 5, ranged farther away from their mothers, and for longer periods of time than did London children of comparable status.

What I am suggesting is that our goals should be one of best preparing the developing child for a later successful adjustment to his environment, and not simply allowing a stressed mother a free babysitting service at the expense of the child.

Evidence shows that human beings who grow up most stably, self-reliant and cooperative, are those who throughout infancy, childhood, and adolescence have had constant parental affection and support in times of stress.

If you will indulge me, I'll tell a brief story reported to me by my brother, Philip, who is a Congressman from the State of Illinois. He told of a colleague who had a couple of sons. And when he came home from work one day his wife complained, "You're gone just too much of the time. You are gone so often I am having trouble controlling our two sons." The colleague responded, "OK, I will see what I can do about it."

His wife especially complained that the boys were using profane language. The next morning while sitting at the breakfast table, the one son looks at his dad, and he says, "I want some of those —— Wheaties."

The father cracks him across the mouth knocking him to the floor. The other son is sitting there watching and the father says, "Well, son, what would you like?"

He says, "I sure as hell do not want any of those damned Wheaties."

I tell this story facetiously, at the same time emphasizing that parental influence within the family constellation, both mother and father, is of some significance. And having a constant environment that is relatively unchanged, helps in that development.

Quoting Bowlby again, he says, "among the experiences of people *markedly deficient* in these respects (emotional development) are the absence of mother figure, repeated separations from a mother figure, frequent rejection by the mother figure, or father figure, and threats of abandonment by a mother figure, including threats of suicide."

Dr. Ainsworth's studies tend to corroborate Dr. Bowlby's, and she says that she has identified a maternal behavior pattern which she describes as the "tender careful holding." In essence, this means that the degree, frequency and tempo of mother's response to the early developing child significantly affects that child's later responses to physical contact and adjustment.

What it boils down to, according to Dr. Ainsworth, is that you cannot love your child too much. While many mothers have feelings of rejection about children, we have to assume that this does not apply in the majority of families. And who has the greatest investment in the developing child, a mother or a babysitter?

When I was in law school, I had a classmate of mine who was watching over his oldest daughter who was then 7 years of age.

A 9-year-old cousin was over visiting at the time, and while this law student was studying, things got quiet in the backroom. He went back there only to find his 7-year-old daughter without a stitch of clothes on, in bed with his 9-year-old nephew, he, too, being naked.

He said he tried to figure out what to do, whether to disappear through the floor, or whether to throw the young boy out the second-story window, or what.

He ordered them both to get dressed, ordered the nephew out in the living room, and then he sat down at the bedside with his daughter and said to her, in essence, this is not the kind of behavior he wanted or expected from his daughter, or from a young lady.

How many of you would be willing to allow your own child to be in the hands of a third party to handle just such a situation? And while the crises in child rearing may just be momentary events, who would be willing to subject those moments to the minds and behavior of another party? I would not!

I married my wife because I wanted her to be there in those crises. Or if I was tending the children, that I would make the decisions at the time of the "crisis."

Dr. Ainsworth was involved in a study of children in which they took 1-year-olds and sent them through separation episodes of less than 9 minutes. They took a child 1-year-old, separated it from its mother for less than 9 minutes. And then upon repeating the episode, they found a significant degree of anxiety was experienced by the child.

Two weeks later they subjected the same children to the same testing and found the anxiety levels even higher on separation.

This tends to suggest that the child does experience anxiety with separation from that home environment.

I am going to read a quote here from an article written by Ms. Jane Wilson. It appeared in Esquire magazine. The title is, "Do Americans suddenly hate kids?"

Ms. Wilson says, "What about the Kibbutz children, are they all emotional cripples? What is emotional development, anyway? The world is full of remarkable people who childhoods were miserable. The working mother tells herself that her baby's childhood will not be miserable. He is loved and well provided for."

Well, I would like to answer some of the questions, or some of those remarks that she made.

First of all, James Russell Lowell once said, "Low aim, not failure, is crime."

To be sure, all Kibbutz children are not emotional cripples. But we do not know how many *are* emotional cripples. And if we know of a positive alternative, I suggest we take that positive alternative. If at all possible, this means keeping that child with its mother during the developmental years.

Item No. 2, she makes the remark about history being recorded with the lives of very remarkable people who had childhoods that were miserable. But does a person like Van Gogh, or even Abraham Lincoln, offset an Adolf Hitler?

Is it worth the gamble, or should we try for something better?

I think we should at least strive for the best we can do, and I think basically there is supporting data to suggest that the home environment is, in fact, the best place for the child.

Ms. Wilson alludes to the working mother who tells herself that her baby's childhood will not be miserable, he is loved and well cared for. I suggest these mothers are rationalizing.

During my wife's first successful pregnancy, she had to be down flat on her back for the last 3 months of that pregnancy. So when I came home from a day's work I had to do everything, from emptying bedpans to dusting the house, and fixing dinner. Let me emphasize that I am a male chauvinist pig to the nth degree. I am also a "high energy type" of person.

I found, however, that upon coming home after a day of working in the office, that little things that would not normally have bothered me, did in fact bother me. And I was not as good a husband to her after a day's work, after taking on the household jobs, as I would have been if I did not have to devote 8 to 10 hours in the office.

I suggest that any working mother knows she is in a compromised situation. While it may be a necessity, she should at least admit that it is a compromise, and that she is not as good a mother when she comes home as she would be if she were remaining in the home and rearing that child. Either that or she's cheating on her employer.

I gave a talk on this subject to a group of women in Chicago, and one stood up and said, "I go to work in the morning, and when I come home, I am really a better mother. I've avoided the phone constantly ringing, the kids crying, et cetera."

I suggested to her she was raising the either/or fallacy in logic. She was suggesting that there was no viable alternative available to her. If she needed to get out of the home part time for a few hours, there are all kinds of places where she can volunteer her work. This was in Chicago.

Hines Hospital is clamoring for volunteers to come in and spend time with bedridden veterans. There are many ways to devote one's time, part time, away from the home if that was her argument. That was not, in my opinion, her argument. She, in fact, said she wanted to get out of the house. She did not want to rear those children.

I suggest if there are mothers who feel that way, perhaps another alternative is better. But I think something other than a governmental alternative might be available to them.

Is it fair to subject the children of lower income families to an environment without their mothers for significant periods of time?

Lastly, but not least important, I think you all should be extremely cautious of experts like myself, especially in the social sciences. Our intentions may be well meaning, but our conclusions may be erroneous.

And rearing or studying human behavior is so complex, that I do not care who the expert is, we all will admit that there is a significant margin of error. There are obviously some experts, I think, who have better credentials than others.

Perhaps the family about whom I spoke earlier that had reared the 124 children constitute the best experts of all.

My final statement to the committee, and I hope all the members of the committee will address themselves to it, is this, "Would you want your own children reared in a day-care center?" We are all acutely aware of many of the people on Capitol Hill who talk about the public schools who have their own children going to private schools.

Well, I would ask you to at least address yourselves to the question of, do you want your own children in a day-care center. And if you do not, why should we subject anyone else to such an existence?

Thank you very much.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you, Dr. Crane.

I think that was the greatest speech I ever heard for guaranteed family income.

[Laughter.]

Mr. LEHMAN. I did send my child to a day-care center. My oldest son did go to a day-care center, a publicly operated day-care center, with children of low-income families. And he was benefited by that. And my other children went to just regular private schools, and I could not see much difference between the experience my oldest son had and the other two.

I just wondered—I could not see that much difference. I guess your children stay home and do not go any place?

Mr. CRANE. Mine do not.

Mr. **Lehman.** I think we could argue both ways on that. But I think your comments are interesting.

I cannot argue with your point that you cannot program, and you cannot computerize human behavior at any age. I think we must bear this in mind.

I would just like to see if any of the other people here would like to discuss it. I am going to have to be leaving to make a quorum call. And if there are any of the other members of the panel who came before us today who would like to join in, I am sure they cannot wait to ask you questions.

Suppose we kind of get a little crossfire here and see what happens. I do have a quorum call right now. I might not agree with you, but I do not find you boring.

[Laughter.]

Mr. **Crane.** Thank you.

Mr. **Lehman.** Chief Counsels of our House and Senate subcommittees, Mr. Duncan and Mr. Johnson will take over.

Mr. **Duncan.** Dr. Caldwell, Dr. White, would you like to respond?

Dr. **Caldwell.** I would like to say that that episode about the 7- and 9-year-olds would not happen in the day-care center.

Mr. **Crane.** Famous last words.

Dr. **Caldwell.** But I fully agree with what he said about do not trust your witnesses. I think I made that point earlier. We do not know all the answers here.

I think his citing Bowlby is interesting. John Bowlby is a great and renowned international scholar, and he has done a great deal that relates to the development of young children and their tie to their parents.

He is also a very magnanimous man who has publicly changed his mind. In 1952 he wrote a book called "Maternal Care and Mental Health," done, I believe, at the behest of the World Health Organization. He tried to summarize all the literature known at that time about the effects of what he kind of came to call "maternal deprivation," and concluded that any separation of an infant from his mother was harmful.

The data that he used for this analysis were largely drawn from children who had been in institutions, totally separated from their families.

Dr. Bowlby and Dr. Ainsworth, also, frequently quoted by Dr. Crane, did a followup study, a number of followup studies, in which they tried to look for the effects of children—on children of this kind of separation when they moved forward.

That is, they started now and followed what happened, and did not find a group of adults who had presumably had this experience early in infancy. They were never able to demonstrate these devastating effects.

A paper he wrote in 1964, Dr. Bowlby, having magnanimously said, "I think I overstated the earlier conclusions."

This is a very good example of the kind of thing one does have to be very cautious about. I caught myself touching on that earlier, Dr. Crane.

The study he referred to that points to positive differences in anxiety between day-care and non-day-care children was reported recently.

It is not in print yet. It is by a young woman named Blahar, a student of Mary Ainsworth. I had a chance to see a prepublication issue of that.

She has a group of 30-month-old infants, 30- and 40-month-old children. The main differences are all associated with some strange functioning in the 40-month-old, that is, the older children in the group.

Had that group not been part of the sample, she probably would not have found any kind of significant difference.

It is interesting if you try to repeat that kind of study. Now, that is done with a middle-class sample selected by private pediatricians in the Baltimore area. If you try to duplicate that study with a group of low-income parents, as a pure researcher, you would be very frustrated, because you would not find "pure samples." You would not find a 40-month-old child who has had a single pattern of care for a 6- to 8-month period.

One other thing I would say in relation to Dr. Crane's remarks—and I really think some of those remarks reveal almost a callousness about the fate of children where there are family problems.

Actually, I would agree with him. I, and my students will tell you this, almost glorify the typical family life we all dream of. And I am fortunate enough to be a member of such a family, too. But an awful lot of children are not. They are neglected and abused children. There are children for whom the fate is the most dismal thing in the world, unless an enlightened society tries to help them.

So one thing, I think, in his remarks, he concentrated so heavily on the day-care aspects of this bill, or these bills. One of the things I like so much about the bill, and that was really my first point, the diversity of service. We are not talking about a plan here just to make day-care more available.

There will be a wide variety of services available, including the thing that is obviously most needed to help more families have the kinds of conditions you are calling for, namely, contentment and happiness, and a commitment to the children.

That is, parent education is one of the things that could be set up on the basis of funds in this bill. And in my mind, there is no question but what some of our young people need a whole totally new orientation about the importance of their roles as parents.

But at the same time, I am not willing to write off the 6 or 7 million children that might be there and need help in the meantime who do not have these things, who do not have all of those conditions.

Dr. CRANE. May I respond to that?

I happen to work in a community, Indiana University. I have the opportunity to examine many of the professors' families and their children, who are perhaps those "enlightened thinkers" about which Dr. Caldwell is alluding. Their families, at least the ones I see, and about a quarter of my psychiatric practice consists of university clientel, they have a distorted view of the family constellation. And so I am a little concerned when we talk about the enlightened thinkers.

Dr. CALDWELL. You are strengthening my point.

Dr. CRANE. Will you let me finish?

Enlightened thinkers, that is, those who are going to determine what constitutes this type of legislation, and what constitutes the proper guidelines. In fact, we know the very point to which Dr. Caldwell alluded. And that is that there are so many variables that I do not think we are really smart enough to know the correct answers.

Dr. **Caldwell.** Then what are the alternatives? Do families like your family have the kind of information, and all the answers? And if so, are you not obligated to help supply some of these?

I gather you are also one of these professor families, as am I. And I think that one of the almost destructive aspects of criticism of such attempts is to imply that there is any kind of reasonable alternative. Reasonable alternative is a vacuum, to say that nobody tries to do this.

Dr. **Crane.** How about making educational facilities where the parents can come in voluntarily, and accept the kind of information that might help them to be better parents?

Dr. **Caldwell.** That is one of the things specified in this bill.

Dr. **Crane.** Right. I think that is an alternative. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Dr. **Caldwell.** But you are not troubled about what is going to be taught them?

Dr. **Crane.** Well, I am a little troubled about what they are going to be taught. But you talk about the extreme case.

I'm very familiar.—the children who are coming from deprived environments. I interned at Cook County Hospital in Chicago, and had an opportunity to see the children that are coming in from the very environments to which you are alluding.

To be sure, I saw things happening there that very much distressed me. I saw a mother who brought in an infant child who had a severe case of pneumonia. We treated the child and I told her to come back the next day for more medicine. She returned 2 weeks later. She brought in a baby that was almost dead.

I said, "Why did you not come back for that treatment?"

She said, "Doctor, I could not afford the bus fare." And she chain-smoked the entire time she was there.

I said, "Would it not be better to invest the 50 cents in a bus ride than in a pack of cigarettes?"

Dr. **Caldwell.** But would it not also have been good to invest in that child, and see that somebody followed up to see the child got the service that was needed? This is the kind of child I am saying we cannot afford to neglect.

I can name cases, even in a public school, children whose parents are not fully aware of what the children need.

I certainly would not put myself up as an arbitrator who can specify it. But I do think that there is a body of common knowledge, if we will about conditions that are necessary for growth.

Though I would not say I am an expert, I am more than happy to share with parents and children who need this, whatever we have. And I think we have to have this kind of facility available.

One final point, and then I will hush.

I seldom speak as a woman. I like to try to speak as a person. But I resent the remarks that wanting to get out of the house is the same as not wanting to rear children. I think that we do not need to cloud the issue with such remarks that make the assumption that anybody who expresses a need for a broader avenue in which to participate in life is necessarily not wanting to rear children. That accusation is no more relevant to mothers, I should think, than it is to fathers. And I do not think we should have that even as part of our record.

I will hush.

Dr. WHITE. There are a couple of things that Dr. Crane said with which I would agree. But the picture he forms of the facts, there are parts of it I would disagree with.

It seems to me that, as I see the bill, my hope is that that bill will be a family strengthening bill. I mean that. I am not playing games with words.

I see the central thrust of the bill as fundamentally strengthening the ability of the family to deal with the child.

If you talk about the invasion of the family by the public, that has been done. That has been done a long time ago. The family has been sharing responsibility for the rearing of the child with the school, with social service workers, with various other professionals for a long time.

I centered my testimony on the fact that we bought a set of social bargains a long time ago, and those bargains exist. As I see it, the heart of disadvantage in childhood is not so much symptoms in the child, or symptoms in the family, or symptoms in the system, but maladjustment of those bargains.

Families do not rear a child completely nowadays. They steer the child toward a school, they have to work with the school. They work in concert with a variety of other agencies that have not only responsibility, but power vis-a-vis the family. I see the bill as attempting to readjust a situation which has, I would say, gotten difficult. It has gotten difficult for families.

Now, the bargains involve not simply distribution of child care. It involves the distribution of time the family gives to economic issues, and so forth.

We provided for day care a long time ago. I believe one of the reasons we provided the public schools was in part to provide day care.

Public schools were not set up for just common schooling. They were set up in part because of problems of child labor. They were set up in part because of the families who had urbanized needed to work, and needed to have some support and care for the child.

So I think we are into it. I think we have a partnership between society and the families, and I think that partnership is a little bit out of joint. I think it is out of joint for the reasons I tried to give in my testimony. And I see the bill as trying to readjust that partnership.

Dr. CRANE. May I ask a question?

You said the schools and other agencies. What other agencies?

Dr. WHITE. Social agencies, health programs. I think a lot of what we call disadvantage is based on the fact that many health agencies are designed to work mostly in middle class families, and poor families have trouble working with them. Poor families (a), have trouble having access to them; and (b), they do not behave in ways that are sort of natural for middle-class mothers.

And, therefore, you get into the problem of whether it is the mother's fault because she does not do the right thing, or the physician's fault. But I think there is a kind of contract in existence, mostly a mainstream contract, which assumes we are dealing with a fairly standard kind of family. We assured, historically, that if the families were not standard, the assumption often was that they would quickly become standard. The assumption often was that we would melt people together so they would all do the right thing.

I think those contracts are too rigid, too brittle. I think the whole point of all the legislation on disadvantage is to fundamentally try to reform those contracts.

Dr. CRANE. I was the director of a clinic, the type of which I think you mentioned. One of the problems we found in running the clinic was that, primarily, middle-class people used it.

The question was, How do we get disadvantaged people to utilize the facility? We were available. All it meant was getting their persons to the clinic. They would be seen immediately, or within a very reasonable period of time. The problem was one of communication. We were not getting the message to these people, or they were not understanding it in our terms.

Well, that was a problem that was relatively easily resolved, at least in a superficial sense. But we still found they would not utilize the facility, even after they knew it was there, because they saw us, essentially, as the enemy.

I mean, we were part of something about which they did not understand.

We had members of their community come into our clinic and work. That still did not solve it, because while they would come in and talk, it was like counseling in the Army. An enlisted man would talk to another enlisted man, but he'd only reluctantly talk to a captain, or an officer, about emotional problems.

Well, the same thing was at least tokenly true. They still did not utilize our facility, because they did not really believe in our facility. But do they not have the right to reject our facility?

Dr. WHITE. They have a perfect right to reject your facility, and I believe that the question is not whether they have the right to accept or reject your facility, but the question in general is to put to people the kind of process that you started in your center. That is, not to simply say that the people do not know enough or do not deal correctly, but to try to find ways to bridge the facility with the people, reserving the power of the people ultimately not to consent to it, not to deal with it.

But the general problem, as I see it, is exactly the problem that you described for the committee, the mental health center let us say times 1 million. It is an additional system spread on a certain assumption of services, which assumption is now too brittle, too stereotyped, not flexible enough.

I believe what I centered on was new bargains between society and families. That is why I tend to see the bill as family strengthening, because I believe the family is at the mercy of society. You just do not rear a child alone now. You rear a child in some ways dependent upon the help of others, or at least are forced to adjust to social conditions. You try to adjust social conditions so families are able to do what you say is central and essential and, I could not agree more, to give love, affection and care to the child.

That is a basic issue.

Dr. **Crane.** You suggest that the families are not reared alone any more. I suggest they never have been. Even back in the days of primitive man, they were sharing.

In our own pioneer days, they shared with the church and got these same exchanges.

So we are saying, in essence, that we are willing to swap these existing areas that affect our children for another governmental agency.

Dr. **White.** There has been a movement over the last 100 years toward greater public support of services. Some of the things we do to help kids now with public support were being done a long time ago. They were being done under private auspices and were not being done particularly well.

There is also a steady historical drift towards community control, that is, out of private charity towards public agencies. From local agencies, then county agencies, then State agencies.

The whole thing broke through at the Federal level at the turn of the century when we built the Children's Bureau, when we held the first White House Conference, when we began to build what we have now—about 225 different programs of Federal aid designed to help individual families, children—that is, aid to the aged, the handicapped, aid to education, et cetera.

I might say people who talk about just giving the money to the State and telling the State to solve the problems ought to ask themselves why the money came, why the power and control came from the States to the Federal Government.

I do believe that we have to rebuild local strength and flexibility, but there were problems at these levels. Those problems caused federalization and the beginning of what we are now into, which is Federal legislation about children.

I believe that there is a level of coordination or social bargaining which can only be addressed on a national level, which is why we are considering a national bill.

I believe the money has to go back to local communities. And, ultimately, the bargaining has to be done at the local level, the kind of thing the lady from Vermont talked about.

But, still, you cannot simply say that families will be sort of attacked by the bill. You have to ask the situation that families are in.

I think families are right now attacked by social arrangements that make it very difficult to conduct a reasonable decent family life. I think what springs up like flowers, like weeds, are those symptoms we call childhood disadvantage, old symptoms, abuse, neglect, now coming from new causes.

Many parents are already separated from their kids. They are feeling pressures that keep separating them from the kids.

The question is how do we adjust the situation to get the parents and the kids together.

Now, I do not think there is anyone more important today than Bowlby. I think he is really one of the great people we have now working on child development.

But I am not really sure you can carry the concerns of Bowlby as far as they are carried by some people. I feel Bowlby is talking about the very early years of life. He is talking about the period from zero to about 3 years of age predominantly. He is talking about the critical period for attachment. He is talking about separation symptoms which are often very violent. There is no question that that is true.

Now, I had some interchange with Congressman Brademas before he left about the word "developmental" as applied to day care.

Now, I am against any conception of day care that holds you are going to pull the child out of the family and you are going to get experts and develop him, because I think there are things, families or people, who care for the child, things they give that no expert, that no amount of knowledge—I mean, it is fundamentally kind of a primate situation.

Still, I am not sure that, for example, societies where there is multiple mothering, that the experience with day care in this country previously, the experience in Soviet countries, the experience of Israel, those experiences suggest that with some safeguards it is possible for the child to spend some time away from the parents.

Now, we do not have much literature on sort of day-by-day time. White has been trying to do a little work with what he calls competent and incompetent kids, and the pattern of parents who deal with them.

For what it is worth, he says a mother whose older child has developed to be competent characteristically spends less hours or minutes during the day than some of the mothers with older kids who are considered to be less competent. He says the issue is not how much time the mother spends with the child.

Every mother knows she spends time away from the child during the day. The issue is what the mother does, how sensibly she works with the child during the time she is there.

You talked about 9 minutes of separation, but you know very well that any parent separates for 9 minutes during the day. You would be a nervous wreck if you did not.

So we are talking about a very strategic pattern of coming in at the right time and doing the right thing. I am nervous about zero to three age care, but even in that range it is not absolutely precluded that you cannot have, let us say situations of multiple mothering. Very expensive day care, I would say, but situations in which people share the mothering with the original mother.

Dr. **Crane.** Would it not be more logical to try to keep that mother within that family constellation, encourage her to stay, rather than encourage the child to be placed elsewhere?

Dr. **White.** I would like that. I really would.

Right now, I would be happier if she wanted to stay there. But we have mothers who say they cannot stay there. They say they cannot stay there economically.

Dr. **Crane.** Let us eliminate the economic argument.

Dr. **White.** All right.

Dr. **Caldwell.** How can you eliminate it?

Dr. **Crane.** By saying we supplement their income rather than paying for the care of the children, which I suggest probably would be cheaper, a whale of a lot cheaper.

Dr. **White.** I will ask you this. I do not know the answer.

You are a psychiatrist and deal a lot more with people face to face than I do.

There is an argument that many women have been cut off from productive roles in society. They have moved off family farms, live in little three-room apartments up there 16 stories high. And they feel they will go crazy.

Dr. CRANE. But you, in your own statement, took the same bait and said, "nonproductive," implying that staying within that family constellation is nonproductive.

Dr. WHITE. I am simply saying what they say. They say, "I did not believe I would grow up to spend all day long being a babysitter."

They say, "If I get out, if I do something meaningful with my life, then I feel I am a better mother."

You mentioned a mother who said that to you.

Now, I prefer in many cases that she stay there if she has very young children. But are you really sure that you know she cannot get away? I do not know.

Dr. CRANE. In fact, I suggest they can get away. I mean there are ways.

Obviously, no mother stays full time with her child from age zero to school age. Once they hit school age, she has a significant amount of time.

Assuming the average family has two children, with an age range or year range of perhaps 3 or 4 years. It's just a few years before they are both gone. I mean that they are in school age.

Dr. CALDWELL. Three to four years? You are talking about no preschool now, or under 3?

Dr. CRANE. I am talking about the mother who has two children and they are within 3 or 4 years of one another in age. This means once they are in school, she is guaranteed *x* number of hours that they are gone.

I suggest, also, that during those earlier developmental years, there is no mother who stays full time with her child. It is an impossibility. The mothers do have time away, which I think is also equally essential. Mothers should be able to be free of their children for a period of time, for the child's sake as well as the mother's sake.

But I am suggesting that this be limited remarkably.

Second, I am suggesting that, if anything, we encourage the mother to stay home rather than be tempted to leave home.

If we make the alternative for leaving more attractive, who would stay home?

Dr. CALDWELL. May I comment on that, because to get it back to the bills, this is what I was trying to stress in this importance of diversity of services.

I gave this example of the mother. I have known it many times, of a mother who did not let us know she was not working because she was afraid that her child would lose out in a particular position.

We tend to think categorically in this country. We think full-time employment versus no employment. There are other options.

To bring this back to this bill, this setting up diverse patterns of service, short-term arrangements, 2 hours a week, mother's mornings out, full day care, all those are described as possibilities in this. There is no question about it.

Dr. CRANE. They already exist though.

Dr. CALDWELL. They do not exist enough. They exist to a very limited extent. They exist to people who can buy the services and so on.

Dr. Crane. No; that is not entirely true, and you know it and I know it; that those services do exist to a great many people who cannot buy those services.

I know in the city of Chicago they exist.

Dr. Caldwell. But you count the children in the families and count the services. You are going to have a big gap between it in any community in this country. That is what I am saying.

Sure, the lucky ones can get them and, again, like your mental health center, why, that was not utilized. It is always a question as to why it does not meet the needs of a particular family.

There was something about the center that did not make it the center of choice, let us say, for the families you said did not use it.

You will find that in any kind of program.

But, in relation to this question of day care for children in the birth to 3 period, the bill has precautions about this.

I have been director of a day care center for children under 3 for close to 10 years now. We have never taken children younger than 6 months because I was very influenced by John Bowlby, who says that by 6 months every infant has formed—every normal infant has formed its basic attachment to its mother.

Our strategy was let us not put children in a day care situation that might possibly weaken that attachment until it has had an opportunity to form.

There is an interesting thing about the data on attachment though; that once it is formed, it is remarkably resistent to extinction.

You can have an abusive or a neglectful mother, a mother who does not do a lot of these things we think of that are described by Bowlby, and still the attachment survives.

So one part of any kind of legislation, particularly for the very young child, should indeed be to try to encourage the development of infant-mother attachment.

You sort of belittled the education. But when I talk about parent education, this is one of the things I am talking about. The importance of availability to your children the importance of you to your childen, men and women. That might not be dogmatic social sciences as yet, but it is commonsense and part of the evolutionary development of knowledge you referred to.

Yet, it is amazing how many people do not think that the infancy period is terribly important. You know, the baby does not do anything but lie there and eat and sleep and so on.

So this is part of what a comprehensive family based program will help to do, to help young people be aware of the importance of that and of the necessity of making themselves available to their children.

Dr. Crane. Let me ask you a question.

I do not belittle parent education. I think letting the parents——

Dr. Caldwell. I thought you did.

Dr. Crane [continuing]. Facilities available they can tap, I think is fine and makes a lot of sense.

However, what if a parent is determined by you to be a bad parent?

I mean, you have decided this child is being subjected to all kinds of trauma, psychic trauma. And the parent is offered the opportunity to come and learn in your educational facility.

Dr. Caldwell. Or your therapeutic facility. I want a little of the load off of me.

Dr. Crane. But he elects to reject it.

Dr. Caldwell. Then I feel you have a mechanism for helping the child.

Dr. Crane. You are saying at that point he does not have the right to totally determine, then, the course of that child, that the State has the right to come in and intervene against the parents' wishes?

Dr. Caldwell. I do not think we have ever specified it clearly. You gave the example of the mother with pneumonia.

Dr. Crane. How about answering my question?

Dr. Caldwell. I will answer it.

Dr. Crane. With a question?

Dr. Caldwell. Right, with a question.

We had a child that was very badly burned. A whole arm was burned. And she would not take her sweater off.

Finally, in calling the mother, I told the mother that the child had to have treatment for this, she would have to take her to the hospital. The little girl, in talking to me about it, said, "My baby's burn is worse," meaning her little sister.

It turned out both children had fallen into a stove. The parent did not realize it needed all that treatment. She told the girl, "Keep a sweater on and it will be all right."

I sent a note home saying the child must be seen by a doctor. The child came with a note saying, "Have the school doctor see her." We do not have a school doctor. We have a school nurse once a week.

I had to then say--I had to then take the child back home personally and say, "This must be seen. It must be taken care of. And you cannot bring her back to school until it is taken care of."

Now, if that is coercive, if that is doing something, taking away the control of that parent, I for one was happy to do it because it really did not take away the authority. She still did it, but it gave just a little push.

And, if you will, it helped her realize a burn is a very serious thing and the children needed attention.

I would personally have felt very guilty leaving the children without any further action once I knew and had seen those burns.

Now, would you?

Dr. Crane. Quite frankly, on the books today we have laws about child neglect that allow us to come in and intervene in exactly those kinds of situations, already existing legislation.

Dr. Caldwell. Did you hear what I said this morning? Were you here at the beginning?

Dr. Crane. I did not hear all of it.

Dr. Caldwell. One of my points was that if we can strengthen families and help them be aware, in that case that was really a conscientious mother. She did not think the burn was serious. All right.

If we can help them become aware of their roles, their responsibilities, and I use that word a great deal, emphasize parental responsibilities as well as parental rights, then I do not think you are going to have to worry about child abuse as much as you do now.

When you say we have child abuse legislation, you had better believe that is legislation that eventually takes the action out of the hands of the parents. You do not want that. Rather, you want the parents to develop awareness of their role in the development of their child and all of their children.

Then, hopefully, you will not have to use your child abuse legislation. You will not have to develop child advocacy programs which imply that sometimes society, whether it is the State or a private facility, or what have you, must step in in behalf of children.

Dr. Crane. I do not disagree with that at all. I think we have legislation that deals with those areas.

Dr. Caldwell. We still need that legislation. And if we can strengthen families, we ought to need it less.

Dr. Crane. Let me also say I agree with Dr. White that the trend has been toward increasing Federal involvement.

Basically, my position is that I do not agree with this involvement. I feel, though, this is the trend. I am testifying here because I am in opposition to that.

If we can slow down that involvement or reverse it, as far as I am concerned, and put the responsibility back at the primary sources, I think that is the direction we should strive for, even though we may not attain it.

In essence, that is what I am working toward. Take the very education you describe and make this education available.

Dr. Caldwell. How are you going to do this? How are you proposing it be done?

Dr. Crane. I would suggest two things.

One, in our own community, Bloomington, Ind., our private medical physicians have formed a medical services bureau.

Our local medical association, state association, has a telephone number that anybody can call and get common medical knowledge at no cost.

We were told 10,000 people in Bloomington, a community of 25,000, were not getting medical care. So we said, we did not believe it.

We did find they finally whittled it down to 150 families who legitimately were not getting proper medical care for the very reason people were not tapping our medical facility.

So we had a facility they felt comfortable with and set up a known telephone number.

We then, as physicians, assimilated these families within our private practices. We knew they were not going to pay. They could not pay. But we were bypassing any resistance, or hoping to bypass any resistance they had toward utilizing the facilities.

Dr. Caldwell. They had to come to your offices?

Dr. Crane. Yes.

Dr. Caldwell. But you know they will not——.

Dr. Crane. No; they did and have utilized the facilities. We were handling it.

There was a problem. To be sure, there are all kinds of problems, the very ones you state.

I am just suggesting that they can best be dealt with locally. We could encourage local organizations to set up their facility by giving them tax credits.

Any time we cut out the middle man, the Federal Government, I think we are one step ahead.

This legislation simply allows the Federal Government to again make what I consider to be another encroachment.

Dr. Caldwell. The program you described, though, I do not think would have helped my mother—I do not mean my mother, I mean the mother I talked about, because she did not realize there was any problem.

Her assumption was that it was just a litle burn. There is nothing to be done.

What I am saying is, yes, there are still situations. Local and Federal has esentially nothing to do with that. We need a community of concern that can somehow be attuned sometimes to the needs of the children, I think.

I want to get this feeling of responsibility.

I wrote a paper recently where I proposed a parent covenant, that parents covenant with their children. I think we talk a lot about the rights of parents and do not talk enough about the responsibilities of parents.

When you have one, you basically should covenant with that child to do everything you possibly can do to meet its needs.

Dr. Crane. We cannot get husbands and wives to do that in the courts where they swear abiding loyalty to their spouses.

Dr. Caldwell. I know. It is the same kind of difficulty. So I think it seems to me you are saying we need those same kinds of things.

You are disagreeing only with who delivers them, doctor?

Dr. Crane. Right.

Dr. Caldwell. I think that is a very important thing.

Mr. Duncan. Dr. White, would you like to make a closing remark?

Dr. White. I will make a closing remark.

I believe we should to some extent get the Federal Government out of business, or out of the business. But I think that I do not know exactly how we do it. The Federal Government I said in my testimony, I believe that the Federal level has recognized that there needs to be an increase in strength at the community level. I believe this is recognized in both Democratic and Republican efforts recently. I said in my testimony that I felt the Democrats, with community action programs, with the parent advisory councils, and the Republicans with the new federalism and revenue sharing have been wrestling with the same problem. While control and power has shifted to the Federal level, there is sometimes too much control and power at the Federal level. The problem with having all the decisions and judgments made at the Federal level were, I thought, beautifully illustrated by the lady who testified from Vermont. She has a Follow Through and Head Start program, and they do not fit together. She has guidelines and cannot explain to people why the guidelines exist because they do not make any sense in terms of the situation she faces.

You could multiply by the thousands stories about the problems of coordination at the local level of heterogeneity of the programs at the Federal level. I do not think we can relinquish certain levels of Federal activity. I think those levels arose from genuine needs. I wish I could sit here and state to you exactly what the proper sector is, the proper reason is for the Federal levels.

I have a theory that the reason why everything federalized is that, first, the city, then the State became arteriosclerotic. Now, our choice is to either rebuild the local levels or go to the United Nations, because with 225 programs on the books you could almost say the Federal level is almost muscle bound. But I do not think so. I think it is a question of thinking about what are the national issues, where do you need local control, what is the distribution of management.

I think again, because I do not have a clear conception, it is hard to say, to give you a theory about why this bill and the way it works will help. But it is my sense that it tries to move in some of the right directions. I think particularly sensitive is the question of the creation of local agencies and local parent councils and creation of devices by which local agencies can funnel funds through to local needs without in fact having to follow the Mickey Mouse that the Vermont lady talked about.

But to say that the Federal Government should step back, do nothing further, I just am not sure about that.

Dr. CRANE. Let me tell you from a very practical standpoint what distresses me about that. I am no longer the director of the local mental health clinic of which I was the founding director. It has now grown into almost a half a million dollar operation in the small town of Bloomington, Ind. I get referrals as a private psychiatrist now from our local welfare department, requesting that I do psychiatric evaluations of welfare recipients for the department because, despite the fact that the mental health clinic is now a half a million dollar operation, the welfare department feels it cannot get a satisfactory report.

Now, when these clinics were developed, there were the same good intentions. But as far as I can tell, I know of no Federal agency that has come into our community that has not gotten muscle bound to the point where they are missing the very point of their original existence. And it is characteristic because there is no way, I mean, if we were running a corporation that took on the magnitude of these kinds of things, there is no way to do it without maintaining real fiscal responsibility. That is, where you have to make a profit.

Dr. WHITE. Right.

Dr. CRANE. If you can overspend your budget or go into deficits indefinitely, you do not have any real accountability. That is the trouble as far as I am concerned with this kind of involvement. I want accountability of the local people. I want them to do it and, essentially, to make a profit, because then they are motivated to work hard.

Believe me, when I do a psychiatric evaluation for the welfare department, they get their money's worth because I want them to know the difference between getting something from the private sector as contrasted with what they get from their own or allied agencies. I'll make sure they get their money's worth.

Well, I see this as a very pragmatic problem. But it is also a very realistic one, as everyone knows, whether it is the Postal Department or whatever. There is a problem within the federal system.

Therefore, I am suggesting that we look to virtually any alternative other than the kind of federalism that you have described, as well meaning as it all is. The persons who have introduced this legislation, I think are well meaning.

But I think we can get into problems that we really must look at with great scrutiny because we are talking about people's lives and family constellations that may have ramifications 25, 50, 100 years from now.

And when in doubt, move cautiously. I think we are in doubt.

Mr. **Duncan**. Dr. Crane, Dr. Caldwell, Dr. White, we, on behalf of both the subcommittees, House and Senate, would like to thank you for this dialogue. It has been very helpful and we hope to hear from you again.

At this point I order printed all statements of those who could not attend and other pertinent material submitted for the record.

[The material referred to follows:]

Testimony on S. 3754 and H.R. 15882 - The Child and Family Services Acts of 1974

Prepared by: Helen L. Gordon, Board Member, Day Care and Child
Development Council of America and Day Care and
Child Development Council of Oregon)
5022 S.E. 45th
Portland, Oregon 97206

A few months ago I had a call from the Assistant Director of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, in Washington D.C. She told me that there were now 43% of the American women involved in the labor market. She questioned me as to why I thought there was that large a number.

My reply to her was in two parts:

1) Many women are earlier trained to engage in some particular job, and have gone into it, encouraged greatly these days by the rise of the women's equality movement.
2) Many mothers now find it necessary to enter the labor market in order to increase the income of their family, thus making it possible, or barely possible, to meet the rising cost of living

However, we have not kept pace with the rising number of women in the labor market in providing the services necessary for them to be good, productive, stable employees. There are too few day care facilities which they can use or fees which they can pay. But with the additions to the Social Security Act of Titles IV A and IV B, some day care services were provided to families of persons who were present, former, or potential welfare recipients, and those who were being trained for jobs. This, however, required the active organization in communities to do planning and to unlock the resources which would be matched against the Social Security dollars. For those who did not meet the category of present, former, or potential welfare recipients, problems were difficult, because while their salaries might allow them to partially meet the routine costs of living, they did not include enough for them to meet the costs of good day care.

And while this lack of programs which families can use creates problems for the mothers and fathers, there are others who share the problems. Let me cite a few examples: one personnel manager of a large hospital in Portland, Oregon, told us that in one department, which employed primarily women, had 110% turn over in one year, and the major reason was lack of child care services. The Vice President of one of the largest banks told us that they had 40% turn over among female employees, with the major reason being lack of child care facilities. The personnel manager of Bell Telephone company in Portland said that their turn over, absenteeism, tardiness rates had gone up considerably, the major reason being lack of child care. Then, too, I remember what a personnel manager told a group on the day I spoke to the personnel committee attached to the Chamber of Commerce. After I finished talking he asked if he could say something, and I said, "Of course." And he said, "We personnel managers and our substitutes are concerned not only about personnel now, but personnel for years to come, and those children you talk about, Mrs. Gordon, don't remain children. And if they are not given good care now, they will grow up as crippled adults from which we have to select manpower." In a survey done of school-age children across some of the areas of Southeast Oregon, we find that 89 of 1,000 school agers had one or more serious encounters with the police, or were already classified as juvenile delinquents. And the major reason was that they were wandering the streets alone before and after school for lack of child care. And remember, this is not the large city, like New York, Chicago or Detroit.

So, the supporting resources which should be matched against the federal funds, must come from business, industry, etc. either in direct cash or in services. For example, Tektronics and Bess Kaiser Hospital in Portland are building new, additional centers for their operations. An approach ought to be made to them that they add some rooms which could be used for day care centers, for the children of their employees. This would make a great contribution, and could be matched against the federal dollars.

H.R. 15882 must include a section on a fee schedule for children who are not economically disadvantaged, but come from homes where the salary of parents does not cover the cost of full day care fees.

The House and Senate bills should match more closely on various sections. The House bill, as well as the Senate bill, must recognize that training is not only in terms of early childhood education but must cover that child, and services to child and family, up to age 15 and beyond. And this means not only on the professional level, but also on the para-professional level, and might include the certification of child development associates.

I welcome the fact that the bill calls for the coordination of all of the agencies that in one way or another affect services to child and family, thus possibly preventing antagonisms, lack of programs being developed, and really a waste of money, which comes from the taxes of people in our society. I trust that the regulations which will be developed for the operation of this act will assure coordination, and really lead, also, to some coordination of services, on astate, county, and city level. We have begun to develop some of this coordination through our State Department of Human Resources and our City and County Bureaus of Human Resources. A federal bill moving in this direction would be very helpful.

I see the problems of families having to hunt their way to the proper program or resource without such coordination, and it is frustrating to the families as well as, I am sure, to the various agencies who really are dealing with one piece of the family and child needs when there should be a connection of all these services.

This act really begins to spell out this coordination, while at the same time preventing the intrusion of the Federal Government into family life. It guarantees and requires that state and local sponsors will have full parental involvement, and that all services will be voluntary. It also provides special grants to individuals who might be interested, or could be encouraged, to seek entrance to professional or para-professional training.

This, and the appropriation of some funds for acquiring or remodeling buildings certainly will help.

The American Parents Committee, Inc.
Incorporated in 1947 as a membership, non-profit, non-partisan, public-service association
Working for Federal legislation on behalf of the nation's 75 million children

Kindly reply to office checked:
☐ NATIONAL OFFICE: 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017—Telephone: MU 5-4400
☐ [redacted]

August 9, 1974

Senator Walter F. Mondale
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale:

The American Parents Committee is pleased to learn of the introduction of the Child and Family Services Act of 1974. At the point when you invite testimony from national organizations, I hope that you will ask the American Parents Committee to testify on the legislation.

For now, we would like to make these comments about the legislation and ask that you insert them in the Congressional Record or in the Hearings record.

The American Parents Committee commends Senator Mondale, Representative Brademas and the other Members of Congress for their sponsorship of new child and family focused legislation.

We believe that this legislation is very important, because it will help spark the kind of discussion and examination of the needs of children and families that is required if we are to arrive at sound legislative proposals.

We are extremely impressed by these features of the legislation:

- The bill provides new money for additional, badly-needed services for children and families.
- The standards will ensure that services are of good quality.
- There is specific funding for enforcement of those standards.
- Services to be provided will be free to many of those who need them most.
- Participation in all programs and services will be voluntary.
- An important role is mandated for parents.

Officers

Chairman
GEORGE J. HECHT, Publisher, Parents' Magazine; Vice President, Child Welfare League of America

Vice Chairmen
DR. MARTHA M. ELIOT, former Chief, U. S. Children's Bureau

JOSEPH H. REID, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America

BERTRAM BECK, Executive Director, Henry Street Settlement, N.Y.

BERNARD LOCKER, Social Welfare Consultant, Washington, D.C.

Secretary-Treasurer
STEPHEN J. LYNCH, V.P./Finance, Parents' Magazine Enterprises, Inc.

Executive Director
(in Washington Office)
[redacted]

The officers, directors and National Council members of the American Parents Committee, Inc. may not personally endorse (nor are the organizations with which they are associated in any way committed to) all legislation favored by the APC. The APC's position on Federal legislation for children in which it interests itself is determined by its Board of Directors, which gives its approval only if a majority of its members concur.

Board of Directors

The above officers and:

CHAUNCEY A. ALEXANDER, Exec. Dir., National Association of Social Workers, Washington

MRS. JOYCE PHILLIPS AUSTIN, Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Children Service, N.Y.

DAVID BAIRD, President, Baird Foundation and Lansing Foundation, N.Y.

EDITH F. BALMFORD, former Chairman, National Council on Illegitimacy, N.Y.

PHILIP BERNSTEIN, Executive Director, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc.; Chairman, Social Issues & Policy Committee, National Assembly for Social Planning & Development

(Continued on reverse side)

Board of Directors (continued from other side) and National Council of the APC

MRS. FITZHUGH W. BOGGS, Vice Chairman, N.J. Council on Developmental Disabilities; Chairman, Nat'l Advisory Council on Services & Facilities for Developmentally Disabled

ELI E. COHEN, Executive Secretary, National Child Labor Committee, N.Y.

DR. ROBERT COLES, Student Health Service, University Health Services, Harvard University

HAMP COLEY, Vice President, Voluntarism Division, United Way of America

JAMES R. DUMPSON, President, Council on Social Work Education; Dean, Fordham School of Social Service

MRS. MARION WRIGHT EDELMAN, Director, Children's Defense Fund, Washington Research Project

EDWARD L. ERICSON, Member Steering Committee-Joint Washington Office for Social Concern

BERNARD C. FISHER, Director, Dept. Public Affairs, Community Service Society, N. Y.

M. B. FOLSOM, former Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Director, Eastman Kodak Co.

DR. ROBERT FRAZIER, Executive Director, American Academy of Pediatrics, Evanston, Ill.

PIERCE J. GERETY, Attorney, New York City

C. GERALD GOLDSMITH, Board Member, American Academy of Dramatic Arts

MRS. VIRGINIA M. GRAY, Executive Secretary, Citizens Committee for UNICEF

HELEN HALL, Director-Emeritus, Henry Street Settlement, N.Y.; Chairman, Board of Directors, Citizens' Committee for Children of New York

HON. EDWARD HEALEY, Jr., Judge, Juvenile Court, Providence, R. I.

MRS. GEORGE J. HECHT, Board Member, N.Y. Service for the Handicapped; Board Member, Play Schools Association, N.Y.

W. O. HEINZE, Vice President, Child Welfare League of America

MRS. HENRY A. INGRAHAM, Board Member, Nat'l Assembly for Social Policy & Development; Member, Board of Higher Education, New York City

ALFRED J. KAHN, Professor, Columbia University School of Social Work; Author of "Child Advocacy"

MRS. ALBERT D. LASKER, President, Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation; Co-Chairman, National Committee Against Mental Illness, N. Y.

KATHARINE F. LENROOT, former Chief, U. S. Children's Bureau

MRS. BLANCHE LEWIS, President, United Parents Associations, N.Y.

MRS. BRADFORD LEYS, R.N., Member, R. I. State Board of Education; Director, R. I. State Nurses Assn.

HON. JAMES H. LINCOLN, President, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges

EARL L. LONG, National Director, Project STAR, National Urban League

NORMAN V. LOURIE, Deputy Director of Public Welfare, Harrisburg, Penna.

DR. REGINALD S. LOURIE, Dir., Dept. of Psychiatry, Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C.

JAMES MARSHALL, Attorney; former Chairman of the Board of Education of New York City

RICHARD O. PANCOST, Executive Director, The Children's Village, Dobbs Ferry, New York

DR. GEORGE PERKINS, Exec. Dir., Center for Development of Human Potential, Inc.

MRS. PAUL E. RAUSCHENBACH, Member, N.J. Developmental Disabilities Advisory Council

MILTON G. RECTOR, Director, National Council on Crime & Delinquency

DR. JULIUS B. RICHMOND, Professor, Child Psychiatry & Human Development, Harvard Medical School; Psychiatrist-in-Chief, Children's Hospital Medical Center; Director, Judge Baker Guidance Center, Boston

JEAN RUBIN, Consultant on Public Affairs, Child Welfare League of America

HENRY N. SACHS, Secretary, Council on Social Work Education; Vice Pres., Educational Alliance, N.Y.

IRVIN P. SCHLOSS, Legislative Analyst, American Foundation for the Blind

ALVIN L. SCHORR, Genl. Director, Community Service Society of N.Y.; former Dean, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University

DR. WILLIAM M. SCHMIDT, Dept. of Maternal & Child Health, Harvard University

DAVID E. SCOLL, Attorney; former secy-treas. Nat'l Committee for the Support of the Public Schools

MRS. MARTHA K. SELIG, Exec. Dir. for Community Services, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York

BERNARD M. SHIFFMAN, Executive Director, Community Council of Greater New York

C. EDWARD SINGER, Washington Director, Nat'l Board of YMCAs

WALTER L. SMART, Exec. Dir., National Federation of Settlements & Neighborhood Centers, N.Y.

DR. MARILYN M. SMITH, Exec. Dir., National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D.C.

JACOB L. TROBE, Executive Director, Jewish Child Care Association of New York

MRS. RENA UVILLER, Director, National Juvenile Rights Project, American Civil Liberties Union

IRA D. WALLACH, Pres., D. S. and R. H. Gottesman Foundation, N. Y.

JEAN WHITTET, Director, Public Policy Center, National Board YWCA

ELIZABETH WICKENDEN, Social Welfare Consultant, N. Y.

DR. ELLEN WINSTON, President, Nat'l Council for Homemaker-Home Health Aide Services; former Commissioner of Welfare, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare

National Council

(Listed alphabetically by States)

DR. LUTHER H. FOSTER, President, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

F. FREDERICK DELLIQUADRI, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Alabama; former Chief U.S. Children's Bureau

DR. E. H. CHRISTOPHERSON, Nat'l Committee for Children & Youth, Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, Cal.

SAMUEL P. BERMAN, Executive Director, Vista Del Mar Child-Care Service, Los Angeles, Cal.

DR. DONALD S. HOWARD, Dean, School of Social Welfare, Univ. of California

DR. NORMAN B. ROTH, Professor of Social Work, California State College, Sacramento

DR. O. V. PORTERFIELD, San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, Cal.

DR. HARLEIGH B. TRECKER, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Connecticut

MRS. FREDERICK B. FORBES, Commission on Children & Youth, Honolulu, Hawaii

DR. DONALD BRIELAND, Assoc. Dean, School of Social Service, Univ. of Chicago

NAOMI HIETT, Executive Director, Illinois Commission on Children

MRS. LT. COLONEL LOYD ROBB, Social Service Consultant, The Salvation Army, Chicago

RANDEL SHAKE, National Child Welfare Director, The American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.

DR. GEORGE N. SHUSTER, Assistant to the President, University of Notre Dame, Indiana

DR. WALTER L. STONE, Consulting Sociologist, Hanover, Indiana

DR. EDWARD GREENWOOD, Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kan.

CHARLES O. YOST, Director, Division for Services to Children in Foster Care, Baton Rouge, La.

MRS. LOUIS AZRAEL, former Vice Pres. Baltimore Health & Welfare Council

DR. WILLIAM G. HARDY, Director, Hearing and Speech Center, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.

ROBERT M. MULFORD, General Secretary, Mass. Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children

CLARICE FREUD, Chairman, Michigan Youth Commission

RICHARD J. CLENDENEN, President, Nat'l Council of State Committees for Children & Youth, Minneapolis

BERT SHULIMSON, Executive Secretary, Missouri Assn. for Social Welfare

DR. URIE BRONFENBRENNER, Professor, Psychology & Human Development, State College Human Ecology, Cornell University

HON. EUGENE A. BURDICK, District Judge, Williston, North Dakota

DR. RALPH H. OJEMANN, Educational Research Council of Greater Cleveland

SOL MORTON ISAAC, former President, Family Welfare Assn. of America; Attorney, Columbus, Ohio

MRS. SYLVIA CAROTHERS, Consultant Children's Services, Health & Welfare Council, Phila., Pa.

NATHANIEL GOODMAN, Executive Director, Jewish Family & Children's Service, Pittsburgh, Pa.

MRS. HORACE SAWYER, former Chairman, South Carolina Committee on Children and Youth

DR. ROBERT B. AIKEN, M.D., M.P.H., Commissioner, Vermont State Dept. of Health

DR. ROGER P. ELSER, Dir., Special Education, Dept. Education, Charleston, West Va.

ARTHUR P. MILES, Director, School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin

MRS. W. H. DOUGLASS, former Chairman, Wyoming Youth Council

The American Parents Committee will work with the Congress on this legislation, which will greatly improve living conditions for many children and families.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE J. HECHT
CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN
PARENTS COMMITTEE and
PUBLISHER, PARENTS'
MAGAZINE

GJH:kk

ANN KLEIN
COMMISSIONER

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES
TRENTON, N.J. 08625

September 16, 1974

Honorable John Brademas
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Brademas:

I would like to thank you for once again taking the initiative toward providing better and more comprehensive developmental child care and family services for the many families in the nation who require them. By introducing H.R. 15882, the Child and Family Services Act, you have once again drawn Congressional attention to the critical needs of families and children in the State of New Jersey and in the nation.

When your legislation is considered in committee, I would appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of this legislative approach. For now, however, I would like to respectfully submit my comments on your legislative initiative, together with a more detailed analysis of the legislation as it would affect the State of New Jersey. With support of Governor Brendan Byrne, we in New Jersey are moving rapidly to expand our child care and family services. Without federal help, however, we cannot hope to meet even a small portion of the need for these services. I hope that the enactment of the Child and Family Services Act will go one step further toward meeting this need.

Sincerely,

Ann Klein

Ann Klein
Commissioner

AK:S

Enc.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 15882 AND S. 3754
THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1974

By: Ann Klein, Commissioner
New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies

The New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies shares with the Congress an urgent desire to expand and upgrade services to children and families. In FY '75, through close cooperation with local governments and community organizations, we will expand our developmental day care capacity by 40%; double services to prevent child abuse and neglect; initiate comprehensive family planning programs; begin early diagnosis and treatment programs for the health of our children; and implement new legislation to divert non-delinquent juvenile offenders from the traditional corrections system. Yet these substantial new programs will not be nearly enough to meet even the most basic needs of families and children in New Jersey. New federal initiatives will be required if we are to continue serving more working mothers, pre-school children, and troubled families.

For this reason I strongly endorse the basic intent of H.R. 15882, the Child and Family Services Act, as well as its companion bill, S. 3754. I believe it is the type of legislation, clear in purpose and broad in scope, that will provide states and localities the resources and flexibility to expand vital child and family services.

The Need For Expanded Services In New Jersey

The growth of child development in New Jersey is illustrated by the increase in child care facilities. In 1966, there were 375 licensed child care facilities. At present, there are about 1,000 centers serving nearly 55,000 children. These centers are the result of dedicated work by local groups and individuals, together with a growing recognition of the state's responsibility for providing adequate child care services.

Yet the combined efforts of public and private agencies have not been enough to meet even the most urgent demands for child care. We estimate that over 100,000 New Jersey pre-school children of AFDC mothers are in need of quality child care but do not receive it. Approximately 45,000 more children of mothers in the labor force with family incomes below $8,500 per year also would benefit from developmental day care. In the State of New Jersey, without even considering middle or upper income families, about 150,000 pre-school children are currently in need of additional developmental day care.

As I indicated earlier, we have moved aggressively to expand developmental center child care in New Jersey. More State money has been appropriated; more federal money under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act is being utilized; more local money, both public and private, has been generated. In FY '75, we estimate that over $30.2 million in State, local and federal funds will be expended for day care services, exclusive of private or headstart centers. Yet our combined efforts are insufficient. New Jersey must have additional federal assistance so that our State can continue to provide more and better developmental child care services. The Child and Family Services Act provides a sound framework for the expansion of resources directed toward child development.

Quality child care is only one aspect of a comprehensive system of services to families and children. We estimate that each year in New Jersey over 25,000 children are either physically abused or severely neglected. We are all too familiar with the horrors of battered children, and we have learned that only an integrated system of social services available to both children and families can prevent this type of abuse.

We plan to double state and local efforts aimed at the prevention and amelioration of child abuse and neglect. Yet more, much more, needs to be done. Once again we need additional federal support. Just as local dollars can generate federal matching dollars, federal dollars can stimulate creative state and local initiatives.

Points of Agreement on H.R. 15882 and S. 3754

A truly effective child and family services program must include the active involvement of parents and professionals, public and private agencies, and all levels of government. We, in New Jersey have begun the process of actively involving these groups. This legislation will further the essential role of the federal government.

Specifically, I endorse the following provisions of the Child and Family Services Act:

1. The authorization of new funds for critical child and family services. We estimate that under this legislation sponsors in New Jersey would be entitled to about $14 million.

2. The recognition and support of the importance of providing a wide range of supporting services such as medical care, parent education, nutrition programs and diagnostic screening to meet the real needs of families and children through the provision of child care.

3. The emphasis on local planning and program operation, particularly the involvement of parents at all levels of program planning and operation.

4. The protection of the rights and responsibilities of parents in the provision of day care and family services.

5. Creation of new national program standards, together with the authorization of funds for training, licensing, and facilities construction to support and help enforce new program standards. We, in New Jersey, have developed tough new licensing standards and look to federal support to help assure their full and rapid implementation.

For these reasons, I strongly endorse this legislation. Some provisions in the bill, however, require further consideration.

Points In Need Of Further Consideration On H.R. 15882 and S. 3754

I believe the following aspects of the Child and Family Services Act require further consideration:

1. Under existing federal programs state government plays an integral role in coordinating service delivery, identifying service needs and goals, and enforcing program standards. The Act as presently constructed would sharply curtail that role, requiring an additional set of administrative procedures for local sponsors. Section 506 discusses the relationship of the Act with Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, but does not mitigate the need for programmatic coordination. This need can best be met by granting states broad authority to plan and coordinate child and family services.

2. A special aspect of this problem is eligibility criteria. Financial and categorical eligibility criteria must be consistent among programs to minimize the need for "means tests". The Child and Family Services Act, the proposed Title XX amendment to the Social Security Act, and Title IV-A have different financial eligibility requirements. If H.R. 15882/S. 3754 and Title XX are enacted, a family might have to prove financial eligibility three times to three different agencies to receive the needed range of services. For example, under the

BLS eligibility standard of H.R. 15882/S. 3754 a family of four with an income below $8,118 would be eligible while under the proposed Title XX standard an income below $10,500 would be required for eligibility. This is no way to promote program coordination or administrative simplicity. I favor the approach to eligibility in your Title XX legislation, which links eligibility to a percentage median family income in a state.

3. Recognizing the great need we have in New Jersey for children and family services, I question the adequacy of the funding authorizations. New Jersey would receive $14 million in federal funds in 1975 under the Act. While these funds would provide substantial new resources, we estimate they would meet less than 5% of New Jersey's child care need.

Keeping in mind the reservations noted above, however, I reiterate my support for the Child and Family Services Act. For families, services such as child care and functional education can be the difference between welfare dependency and productive employment; for children, the difference between child abuse and educational enrichment; for taxpayers, the difference between rising welfare roles and a more productive economy.

The attached addendum represents more detailed comments and suggestions prepared by my staff.

ADDENDUM TO STATEMENT ON H.R. 15882 AND S. 3754 THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1974

Listed below are a series of provisions in H.R. 15882 and/or S. 3754, the Child and Family Services Act, which we believe need clarification, more thorough analysis, revision, or deletion.

1. The Act provides that funds be appropriated annually with appropriations being made the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the funds will be available for obligation. We believe it would be useful to consider advance funding for two or three years with close annual review of those funds. This would facilitate advance planning by prime sponsors.

2. New Jersey has, in the past, experienced difficulty under Title IV-A regulations in securing permission to use public in-kind contributions as part of the local match. We read H.R. 15882/S. 3754 to allow the use of public in-kind contributions, but believe a clarifying statement asserting this principle is needed in the legislation.

3. H.R. 15882/S. 3754 asserts the importance of providing services to families at all income levels. To implement this goal we believe H.R. 15882 should provide, as its companion S. 3754 does, for a sliding fee scale for those families who do not qualify under the financial eligibility criteria.

4. H.R. 15882 identifies section 3c in discussing formulas for state allocation but there is no section 3c in the current legislation.

5. Section 103 of H.R. 15882/S. 3754 discusses the formula for allocation of funds. We are concerned that adequate data does not exist to generate reliable estimates given the variables in the allocation formula.

6. We believe reports cited in Sections 203 and 205b of H.R. 15882/S. 3754 should be available to the public.

7. While we applaud the range of services eligible for funding, we believe at least two important services have not been enumerated

in the present legislation. We believe child advocacy and transportation programs should be eligible for funding under the Act.

8. Section 103a of H.R. 15882/S. 3754 calls for periodic reapportionment of funds if states do not use their yearly allotment. It is not clear if the reapportionment of funds alters the permanent allotment to a state or simply reallocates funds for a single year.

Mr. Duncan. We would also like to announce that the hearings will continue tomorrow at the Peabody School at 525 C Street, Northeast, Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m. The public is invited.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 1:02 p.m., the subcommittees recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Friday, August 9, 1974.]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES, 1974

FRIDAY, AUGUST 9, 1974

U.S. Senate,
Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the
Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty,
and Migratory Labor of the
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;
and the Select Subcommittee on Education,
of the House Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m. at 425 C Street NE., Capitol East Children's Center, Hon. Walter F. Mondale and Hon. John Brademas presiding.

Present: Senator Mondale and Representative Brademas.

Mr. Brademas. This joint hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, the House Select Subcommittee on Education, and the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor, will come to order for the purpose of continuing hearings on the Child and Family Services Act. This act has been introduced in the Senate under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Senator Mondale, and the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator Javits. In the House, the act has been introduced by myself, Mr. Hansen, the gentleman from Idaho, Mrs. Heckler, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and Mrs. Mink, the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

At the outset of these hearings, I know that Senator Mondale and I want to express our appreciation to Gloria Panton, director of Capitol East Children's Center, and her staff, for their cooperation in making possible this hearing here in the Peabody School today.

Yesterday at the joint hearing in the Senate Office Building, we took testimony in support of the Child and Family Services Act from a number of experts on children. Today we are looking forward to hearing from both staff members and parents of the Capitol East Children's Center and the Wee Care, Inc.

The Chair will yield to Senator Mondale for such comments as he cares to make.

Opening Statement of Senator Walter F. Mondale

Senator Mondale. Thank you very much.

As some of you may know, yesterday we began joint hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Select Subcommittee on Education on S. 3754 and H.R. 15882, the Child and Family Services Acts of 1974.

These companion bills are designed to provide financial assistance necessary to help States and localities upgrade and expand their services for families and children. They contain the fundamental principles from the child development legislation which passed the Congress in 1971, but was vetoed by former President Nixon.

Our bills authorize $1.8 billion over the next 3 years to fund a wide variety of services including day care services for preschool children, medical services for expectant and new mothers to reduce the incidence of preventable birth defects, family counseling, education, health diagnosis and treatment programs, and nutrition programs for children.

The serious deficiencies in our present system of providing services for the well-being of young children are especially evident in the area of day care. Today, only 700,000 licensed day care places are available for the 6 million preschool children with working mothers. Our bill will help fill in gaps and improve the quality of care now available to American children whose parents are working.

I am delighted that we are able to hold today's hearing at the Capitol East Children's Center, which is recognized as one of the outstanding day programs in the entire Washington metropolitan area. It is very important to us in our consideration of this legislation to actually visit programs like this one firsthand, so that we can learn directly from the parents, staff and children involved what the ingredients of a good program are—what a program like this one can mean in human terms. Too often, decisions are made without this kind of input. And I want to personally thank all of those involved in Capitol East Children's Center for making this visit possible—and tolerating the inconveniencies we may be causing.

I would simply like to thank the Capitol East Children's Center for being our host today.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We are going to hear first from a panel that will discuss overall child care needs and programs in the District of Columbia. The panel is composed of Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling, president of the National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association; John C. Williams, Jr., cochairman of the Washington Committee for Day Care, and director of the Catholic Charities Model Cities Center; Margery Boichel, chairman of Washington Preschools, Inc.; and Miss Joyce Rawlings, vice chairman of the Parent Policy Committee, National Capitol Area Child Day Care Association.

We have a number of witnesses today, and both the House and the Senate are in session, so the Senator and I are going to be very hard pressed for time. If, therefore, our witnesses will be kind enough to summarize their prepared statements, they will be included in their entirety in the record, and that will give us an opportunity for questions.

Mrs. Keyserling, we would be very happy to have you begin.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MARY DUBLIN KEYSERLING, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITOL AREA CHILD DAY CARE ASSOCIATION; JOHN C. WILLIAMS, JR., COCHAIRMAN OF THE WASHINGTON COMMITTEE FOR DAY CARE, AND DIRECTOR OF THE CATHOLIC CHARITIES MODEL CITIES CENTER; MARGERY BOICHEL, CHAIRMAN OF WASHINGTON PRESCHOOLS, INC.; AND MISS JOYCE RAWLINGS, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE PARENT POLICY COMMITTEE, NATIONAL CAPITOL AREA CHILD DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, A PANEL

Mrs. KEYSERLING. Thank you very much, Senator Mondale and Congressman Brademas.

May I express my warmest appreciation to you for your invitation to testify today on the child and family services bills which you have introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives, S. 3754 and H.R. 15882, and on the relationship of the objectives of these bills to the need for the expansion and improvement of child and family services in the District of Columbia.

My name is Mary Dublin Keyserling. I am the president of the National Child Day Care Association, a private nonprofit agency in the District.

The association operates 15 day care centers for 875 preschool children, 6 day care afterschool centers for 310 children, and 2 demonstration centers—one for 40 children of employees of the National Institute of Education, and the other for 60 children of employees of the U.S. Department of Labor.

I have a special interest in the last mentioned because the Women's Bureau of that Department, which I headed from 1964 to 1969, took the lead in its establishment. The association also operates an early periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment center for children enrolled in its regular centers, and in addition, two special education centers for our preschool children who need their therapeutic services.

Eight of our preschool centers are funded by Head Start through the United Planning Organization, and the two demonstration centers are funded by separate contracts with the Federal agencies involved. The remainder are financed with revenue sharing and Model Cities money, by local public funds, memberships, and by public and private grants for special projects.

Our experience in operating these centers has given us insights into the urgent need for child day care in the city; problems involved in the administration of services, including especially those related to costs and quality; to parent involvement; and to the relationship of programs in the city to the regulatory and funding agencies.

In my testimony I shall also draw on my experience as the present Chairperson of the D.C. Commission on the Status of Women which has established a citywide task force on day care needs and services in the District, in the work of which I have been active, and which is now nearing the completion of its report.

First, may I say how deeply grateful all of us concerned with children are to you, Senator Mondale and Congressman Brademas, for your leadership in seeking congressional enactment of S. 3754 and H.R. 15882. These bills deserve the most vigorous support of all advocates of children throughout the Nation. Their enactment would be a godsend here in the District of Columbia.

I would like to speak to the magnitude of need for child day care services in Washington; what is being done to provide them; how far short we are from an adequate response, quantitatively and qualitatively, to meet our urgent needs; and why the enactment of these bills is of signal importance to this community.

We have a far greater need for child day care services, relative to its population, than most other cities in the country. More than half of all mothers in the District with children under the age of 6, are in the labor force and must find care for their children away from home, when they must be at work. This labor force participation rate is far higher than the national average: Of all mothers in the United States with children under the age of 6, one-third are workers.

I estimate, on the basis of 1970 District of Columbia census data, brought up to date in accordance with known national trends, that there are about 32,000 children under the age of 6 in District households in which the mothers are in the labor force.

In the District, as in the Nation, the great majority of mothers who hold jobs and have young children, work for compelling economic reasons. More than a quarter of them, here in Washington, head their own families, and their earnings are essential to family support. According to the 1970 census, more than half of these District mothers who headed their families and had preschool children, earned less than $5,000; and an additional 3 out of 10 earned between $5,000 and $7,000. And of the families with two working parents of preschoolers, about a quarter had family incomes under $8,000—less than what it takes to provide the minimum essentials families want for their children.

Almost none of these lower income families, and indeed, relatively few of those with higher incomes, can afford private day care services of the quality they rightfully want for their children.

In 1970, according to then published estimates of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, day care of "acceptable" quality was reported to cost $2,348 a year, per child. Adjusted for subsequent price rises, this figure would now be $2,940 a year, or $52 a week. This is the approximate present cost of some of our funded day care centers in the District. Because the cost of good developmental day care is beyond the means of the majority of District families in which the mother is gainfully employed, and because publicly supported facilities providing such care have a very limited child caring capacity, a large number of children in the District are now receiving day care which is custodial at best, and which, in frequent instances, is actually detrimental. This is not only tragic for the children and their families, it is clearly contrary to public interest.

I estimate that 12,000 to 13,000 of the District's children under 6 years of age, and whose mothers work, should have day care services available without cost, since their family incomes are less than $8,000.

At this income level, there just is not the money in the family budget for basic minimum essentials. Currently, the lower living standard budget for an average urban family of four, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the U.S. Department of Labor, exceeds $8,200 and does not allow for day care outlays.

Little children with working mothers are not the only ones who should benefit from the developmental opportunities good day care afford. There are the children in AFDC families whose mothers are in work training, and there are those whose mothers are students.

In addition, I estimate there are some 6,000 children between the ages of 3 and 6, whose mothers are not in the labor force and whose families are in poverty. A large percentage of these youngsters would benefit greatly from part-day Head Start types of experiences. Only about 10 to 15 percent now do.

Such opportunities would make available educational, health, social, and nutritional services, and afford a chance to develop confidence and pride in self, and to start on the road to learning more nearly on a par with others.

Perhaps, then, as many as 20,000 children under the age of 6 in low-income families are the potential eligibles for free care, part day and full day.

Children of 6 to 14, whose mothers are gainfully employed, need adult attention and supervision during the hours until a parent returns home. According to the District of Columbia 1970 census, two-thirds of our city mothers with children aged 6 to 18, were then in the labor force.

In the Nation as a whole, in families with working mothers there were, as of March 1973, twice as many children aged 6 to 18 per household as there were children less than 6 years of age.

With this in mind, it is conservative to estimate that there are at least as many schoolchildren under the age of 14, with working mothers and in low-income families, who need day care services, mainly in afterschool hours, as there are preschoolers with working mothers and in low-income families.

Let me briefly review what we are doing in the city because this is a typical community—no, I do not suppose it is a typical community. It is better than most. We are doing more than a good many, and less than others. I have just completed a study for the mayor of New York on day care services in that city. New York has a labor force participation rate of mothers with children under the age of 6, of 26 percent, half of what ours is, and is doing twice as much for the care of its children relative to its population. We are better than some, but poorer than others.

What are we doing in the District of Columbia?

The Department of Human Resources is purchasing day care services for about 3,700 children. I have asked you to look at the details of what is being done, because nothing brings home stronger how urgently needed your legislation is.

Almost half of these children are cared for in their own homes by someone the mother selects, who is paid by the Department. Now, what do you suppose that Department is paying these caretakers?

For full day care, the caretaker gets $2 a day, or $10 a week. For before-school care, the payment is 50 cents a day; and after-school care, it is 50 cents; and if it is before and after, it is $1.

About 700 children are paid for in family day care homes. What are these caretakers paid? Just $3 a day for all-day care.

I will not go into the further details.

About 1,500 children are provided care in day care centers. What does the Department pay a center for providing care to a child? Just $4 a day and $20 a week. There is no center in the city of Washington or any place in the country to which you would send a child of your own, or where I would send a child, that can provide the services that children need for this amount of money. Fees as low as this mean there must be a high ratio of children to adults. And because salaries must be low, many staff members are either exploited or relatively untrained. Low fees generally mean no social services or health services, and there you are.

I will not go into the eligibility requirements in the city, but they are set at extremely low-income levels. Families have to be really below the poverty level, which is about $4,500, for free care: The limit is set at $3,400.

Families with incomes above that level and up to $7,000 are eligible for funded care at fees scaled to income. Needless to say, we who are advocates of children in the District are deeply concerned with this picture. The amount paid per child, as I have mentioned, is obviously too low both from the point of view of the child and from the point of view of the provider.

If an in-home caretaker looks after two children for the usual 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. day, and two children during afterschool hours, her weekly earnings would be $25 a week or 50 cents an hour. Where can anyone be found willing to work for so paltry a sum, and of what caliber would she be? The caretaker is in a real sense an employee of the Department, for she is paid directly by it.

It is hard to see how the Department in good conscience can tolerate the resulting deprivation of children of adequate care, let alone violate the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In New York State, the administrator of the State welfare department has issued an order calling for the payment of at least the minimum wage for in-home day care providers.

And the same questions are relevant to family day care mothers. If a family day care mother cares for the same number of children as the in-home caretaker I described, she would make $30 a week or 60 cents an hour for 50 hours of work.

With respect to day care centers, a payment of $20 a week is totally insufficient to enable any center to provide even the most minimum of services. It necessarily means a high ratio of children to adults, poorly paid and hence poorly trained teachers. It necessarily precludes the social services many low-income families need, health services, and family involvement which must be funded, too. Such a policy is penny wise and pound foolish for we must ultimately pay a high price for shortchanging our children, in terms of stunted development and all its pitiful consequences.

The Department has justified these purchase of service payments and family income criteria saying that the funds available to it are so limited that it is a question of whether it will serve fewer children more adequately or more children with what it can get at these rates.

Day care proponents and other public interest groups in the city have long advocated raising family income eligibility limits and rates of payment. On June 10, 1974, the Department of Human Resources published in the D.C. Register a proposed regulation to modify existing policies in both regards.

The proposed payments for day care are, in my judgment, still highly inadequate, and I find many problems inherent in the proposed family income requirements and fee scale.

Many of us have strongly urged the District City Council greatly to improve the proposal. But these are local issues which I need not go into in detail here today. I mention them only to indicate that the District, like many other communities throughout the country, is faced with an acute problem. Funds are not available locally to meet minimum needs with any degree of adequacy. We must look to increase Federal funding, such as would be provided by S. 3754 and H.R. 15882, were they enacted, if the needs of more of our disadvantaged children are to be adequately met. What is particularly heartening about these bills is that adequate standards would have to be assured as a condition for funding, consistent with those set forth in the 1968 Federal interagency day care requirements.

In addition to the day care services purchased by HRA, to which I have referred, the Department is using city revenue-sharing funds to provide care for children in 42 privately operated "revenue sharing" centers, 13 of which are afterschool programs. It also funds 19 child day care centers for 450 children, 3 to 5 years of age, operated by the Department of Recreation.

I might mention that we are getting no title IV–A money here in the city for day care. This has been cut off.

Senator **Mondale.** None at all?

Mrs. **Keyserling.** None at all. These funds are not moving into day care.

Senator **Mondale.** That is very strange.

Mrs. **Keyserling.** I thought you would find this interesting, but especially interesting because if we were to use the IV–A money in our centers, we would have to raise 25 percent of the cost; and for every $25 we raised, we would get $75 from the Federal Government up to our city limit, and we do not get this duplication out of revenue sharing.

Senator **Mondale.** Was there a decision made that no IV–A money would go for day care?

Mrs. **Keyserling.** That is correct. I do not want to leave you with the impression that all the care that is being funded by the city is as bad as what obviously is being provided under these purchase-of-service arrangements. Most of the money that is going for day care is of very good quality. To illustrate this, I would like to turn to our own National Capital Area Day Care Centers, some of which are financed by revenue sharing funds. The city administration and HRA should be warmly praised for allocating one-third of the city's revenue-sharing funds for day care programs.

My friends who are joining me here today can speak to the excellent day care which is provided side by side with very bad care.

Last week I decided to visit some of our centers. I sat in a corner, in one center, watching a happy group of 4-year-olds singing and clapping and having a wonderful time. A happy group—with one exception. A little fellow sat on the end of a bench, miserable, utterly withdrawn, and obviously in real trouble. I looked up and saw across the room a woman, not visible to the children, watching and taking notes. She was a staff psychiatrist, deeply concerned with the little boy on the end of the bench. She told me later he was the child of a young high school girl, and of his history of rejection. To make a long story short, the boy will be transferred to one of our special education centers. In 4 months, the center director believes, they can love that child back to normal and bring him out of himself. But he will stay in the special center for 8 months, according to present expectations, because this longer period is needed to work closely with the mother to help her to be a more perceptive, responsive, and responsible mother. The cost of our work with the child and his mother will be about $6,000.

Teachers, social workers, psychiatrists, and psychologists will be involved. Will it be worth it? In human terms, of course. But in economic terms, continued neglect would spell another school dropout in a few years, a human being deprived of his right to function and contribute. Perhaps some years at Lorton.

The passage of your bills would help many little boys and girls at the end of the bench. How badly we need this help! The demonstration grants which make our special education work possible will soon expire. What do we do then, unless this immensely needed legislation is enacted?

To complete the major elements of the service picture in the District: There are presently 40 Head Start centers, operated by four delegate agencies. Two of these agencies run 19 centers that are public school connected: Model schools, 11 centers; and Anacostia Head Start, 8 centers. Capital Head Start runs 13 centers, and the National Child Day-Care Association runs 8.

Some 1,500 children are in these programs, funded under a total Head Start allocation to the District of $2.98 million. Over 1,100 of these children are in part-day programs—3, 4, or 6 hours—and the rest in full-day sessions.

Family income eligibility is limited to $4,320 for a family with one child, and to $4,575 for a family with two. The income limit rises by $325 for each additional child.

In addition to the school-located Head Start programs, the District school system operates 60 prekindergarten classes for another approximately 1,200 children, some of which are in session from 9 a.m. to 12 noon, and others from 1 to 3 p.m. They cannot therefore be considered as part of the day care system for children of working mothers. There are no eligibility criteria or fees.

We have made a beginning, here in the District, with respect to funding day care services for children in low-income families, but there are serious problems relating to the quantity and quality of care and the administration of funding, which are of very real concern to people like myself who want our community to serve our children well.

Briefly and in summary, some of the major issues which trouble us are—

> Total outlays of public funds reach only a small proportion of the children in low income families in need of child care services. For every child receiving care there are 5 or 6 others, or more, equally deserving, not now benefiting;
>
> Outlays per child from public funds are too low to purchase care of adequate quality;
>
> There is no coordination of the various programs; and because of the lack of overall planning, the geographic location of services is poorly related to geographic concentration of need;
>
> There are serious gaps in service. We have very little infant care. There is far too little before- and after-school services for youngsters whose mothers are employed; and
>
> Among those eligible for publicly supported care, the type of care a child receives is largely an accident of where the family lives and to whom the family turns for help. Some eligible children receive free, high-quailty developmental day care in some of our revenue-sharing centers for which the city pays as much as $2,500 a year; other children in families earning the same income receive custodial babysitting services rather than developmental care, and their parents often must pay much of the cost.

Presently, our public funding relates only to children in low-income families. But there are considerably larger numbers of children in families in which the mother is employed, and with incomes between the lower living standard budget and the moderate or intermediate budget—now around $13,000. The labor force participation rates of mothers of children under the age of 6, and with incomes between $8,000 and $13,000, is about 60 percent in the District. These families must rely on their own resources to purchase the day care services they need, primarily from privately operated centers or family day care homes. Few can afford an adequate care provider in their own homes. They need subsidized services with fees scaled to income as proposed by S. 3754 and H.R. 15882.

The quality of care available to them at a price they can afford is a major problem. The number of licensed centers in early 1974 totaled 238, the large majority of which are operated on a proprietary, fee-for-service basis. We do not have an up-to-date study of the quality of care they provide.

In 1970, Kirschner Associates, a national research firm, made a survey of day care centers then in operation. The report concluded that 17 percent were very poor, 19 percent were poor, 21 percent were fair—essentially custodial, not detrimental but not developmental—23 percent were good, 12 percent were very good, and 8 percent were regarded as excellent. Thus, well over half were considered either detrimental or just custodial.

There is no evidence that the quality of our centers has improved since the Kirschner study was made. Substandard centers existed then as now because the District's Day Care Licensing Code is very inadequate and has not been effectively enforced. This is not because day care proponents and other community leaders have not very actively sought improvement.

The situation we confront is typical of that facing many other communities and is one which S. 3754 and H.R. 15882 would be immensely helpful in correcting. By requiring, as a condition of funding, that a local prime sponsor and a Child and Family Service Council be established, a mechanism would be created for coordinating the delivery of services and for developing annual plans, goals, budget and program policies, and program review and evaluation. I note with strong approval that funds for administrative costs and for standards setting and enforcement would be available.

Particularly constructive is the requirement to insure active parental participation through membership on child and family service councils, as well as local and project councils. While in the District parents are involved through parent policy councils established in connection with some of our funded centers, there has been no mechanism for adequate parental input at the citywide policymaking level.

In summary, may I say we strongly support your proposed legislation because it would go far toward expanding and improving child and family services. It would make services available to a broader range of families who need them.

Its provisions for the funding of construction and training are vital. It provides for a system of delivery of services which would be a vast improvement over our present approach.

The enactment of the proposed legislation would be one of the best possible investments of public funds ever enacted by Congress.

It would go far toward strengthening family life.

The expansion and improvement of child and family services it would further is the most urgent item of unfinished business on the American social action agenda.

We fervently hope for its enactment into law at the earliest possible time and pledge our every support.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much indeed, Mrs. Keyserling, for a most thoughtful statement.

Next we will hear from Mr. John C. Williams, Jr.

Senator MONDALE. We are going to hold our questions until the end of the panel and then we will question the whole panel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to thank you for coming to the community to bring your presence to us to see and to experience with us the children that we work with. We are happy to be a part of the condoning and offer our support for this bill that you are presenting.

I am the director of the Catholic Charities Model Cities Center and also cochairman of the Washington Committee for Day Care, Inc., which is an organization comprised of many civic centers that are striving meaningfully for the best quality of care we can get for the children that we serve.

These agencies that are comprised of private and public agencies receive Federal and private funds to provide services to children.

You have listened with interest to the thoughts and statistics of Mrs. D. Keyserling regarding the magnitude of need Washington, D.C., has for adequate, quality, and comprehensive child care. I would like to take this time to help bring home her points from another point of view, that of a child care administrator.

I would like to dispel some common myths for the benefit of the committee. However, before I reach that point the first myth I would like to tackle is in terms of the need for child care itself. Many critics of child care programs hold out the specter of "sovietization" of our children, massive kibbutzes and communal concentration camps for children each of which tears children from maternal breasts daily for programed development.

They see Government intervention into the family and consequently the disruption of our social traditions as Americans. They see millions of dollars wasted; spent on children huddled together blissed out, before a Sesamed-TV set. Why do we need to spend millions to pay for little TV watchers they ask? They see finally, millions of children multiplied by some terrifying four-digit figure that will produce instant astronomical inflation beyond our present astronomical inflation.

After having considered all of this, comprehensive child care development acts are relegated to the ax as unnecessary and unreal. On the contrary, when child development is mentioned as babysitting, communistic, un-American, and inflationary, most child care workers cringe right along with the critics. We cringe because it is not babysitting. Basic to comprehensive child development is the quality of the care that is given to the children served.

Quality here means expert—we are not novices and do not intend to perform experiments on our children. When teachers deal with children at such a young age they have to be experienced, perform professionally and be twice the parent-role-player as the parents themselves. Quality means that the said programs have themselves developed. They must provide nutrition and nutritional values that the child needs in the crucial years from 1 through 5.

They must provide health services: preventive, diagnostic, and remedial. They must provide social counseling to family and child alike; aiding professionally those who require, request, and need it. They must maintain attained social values that tighten, not disintegrate family life. They must aid children to adequately get to know themselves; know how to relate to their peer group, their families, and the world around them.

As cultural development is proving to be essential in stabilizing self-identity, personality, and heritage, many centers must develop related cultural programs.

Finally, these programs must provide education in the strict and lateral sense. They must educate a child to learn, develop, and grow. They must present values about life that can be absorbed and utilized by each child at his development level. They must provide and evaluate the practical academics that apply to that child's life. I will comment on this point later in this testimony.

All of the above qualitative values must also have a universal quality themselves. This latter point leads to the next one about communistic approaches to child development.

Quality day care centers are not the last outpost for low-income children who need "watching" while mother goes to training and/or work. They are not enrichment programs for poor children, they are not preschool ghettos. Day care centers are as individual in their approaches to child development as the children and families who enter them.

They are at their best, responsive to each family's need on individual and community levels. That is, if the school is located in a Spanish-speaking area the program is bilingual and culturally diverse. If there are infants in need there are provisions and different types of care. If there are families who have different needs for care, and there are many, the programs endeavor to accommodate. Quality centers that are aware of children and families have community input; advisory and evaluation group, parent boards; parent involvement and volunteers.

Children are not forced to enter. No child stays the night. No parent must accept what he or she might think is unacceptable child-caring practices; no child is programed with propaganda about life and habitat. No family is deprived of their responsibilities to care for their children. They must themselves be responsible for obtaining medical checkups that are prescribed and the maintenance of their child when ill.

They must fully nurture their child while home and keep strong their primary relationships. In short, both center and family are responsible for providing for life (for all the qualities for sustenance are in-built); liberty (for children are free to go, come, develop and change through recognized child-rearing policies or without us under their parents at home) and the pursuit of happiness (one of our main goals in child care centers is to provide good experiences for children so that they can learn in the climate in which they are most familiar, that of happiness. It is a joy also to us to be a part of that process).

Finally, let us go to the four-digit numbers that so often scare people when they consider child care. It is often said that child care is too much involved with the four-digit numbers, for instance $1,900, $2,500; and for infant care, $3,600 up to $3,900. These figures are indeed low in comparison to Miss Keyserling's figures. But are the figures that we used to multiply vast sums of children that would be necessarily taken in and use this number to give us the astronomical number that would be necessary to have to take care of child care for this country.

I would like to say in that respect that we are not involved with just that aspect of finding out what the numbers are. Through this bill we hope, and we see some evidence of the fact that we are going to be involved and you are going to be involved in finding out what the costs are relative to the needs at hand, child care compared to schools, colleges, and to other learning institutions. The figures for schools and colleges are far below many times the figures used for child care.

However, if you compare, and I have submitted to the committee one comparison of high school costs, elementary school costs as compared to day care costs, you will find that in many instances if preschool programs were operated like public schools, the public schools' costs would be astronomical in comparison to ours. Adequate compensation for teachers in day care programs must be had.

The salary scales differ so widely that—teachers—both with a B.A. in early childhood education, one in a day care program and the other in a public kindergarten—have wide discrepancies in salaries. The one in the day care center works 12 months, 8 hours a day and other in school works 9 months, 6½ hours per day. The starting salary of the day care teacher is approximately $7,500; that of the teacher in school, $8,770. How shall these be reconciled?

The cost of care as we know it can perennially be disputed and quality reduced accordingly to get more children in care or less qualified administrative and teaching staffs only to thwart the purpose of care and add to the detriment of the children.

In a year—1972—when cost overruns in military contracts (not the contracts themselves) ran more than $29 billion, we were being warned that comprehensive child care would cost $20 billion a year. In the first case we paid for $29 billion worth of mistakes, corrections, inflation, delays and ultimately some outmoded products.

We are in hopes that this bill is the beginning of what we were warned against. Not $20 billion but the planning, development and demonstration of a national commitment to the health and development of our young children. This planning and development once organized may be the launching ground for a complete accurate analysis of what the total need may be. It should aid us to determine years from now, hopefully 5 to 10, which way or ways we would like to go in respect to our children and this Nation.

Most child care specialists do not believe by any stretch of the imagination that all American children should be tramped off to day care centers. Nor do they believe by any means that the four-digit multiplier must apply to a vast multiplicand that reaches a product of $20 billion.

Millions must be spent to serve the Nation as large as ours. However, these millions must be spent providing services just as we do for the national parks. The parks are maintained on a priority basis. Parks are not mandatory, however, it is mandatory that we have them for our Nation. So too with child care in comprehensive form.

Many children in our modern day, and this is true of the Nation's Capital, are home with their mothers, relatives and siblings throughout the first 5 years of their lives. They in all probability would not need:

1. Comprehensive child care.
2. Full-day child care, if any at all.

They are receiving adequate familiar, community and educational experiences. They often have financial stability to maintain without the necessity of the guardian to stop parenting and begin working.

Such children have many advantages that may provide them with other caring options. However, no one has yet obtained enough information or devised an adequate system to determine how many such children exist, where they exist or how they are comparing and/or progressing along with other children in center care. No one has made adequate distinctions even for the needs of rural America for child care as they "think" they have for urban America.

In the District just weeks ago one city official determined that it would cost $147 million to care adequately for the children of Washington who need child care. No analytical study exists that we know of proves that this is true. The estimate is not factual but conjectural. Most child care administrators of the District believe that it would cost far less than $147 million if adequate provisions were made for low- and moderate-income families and fee scales similar to the one proposed here.

In short, we are aware of the money it will cost to develop programs and systems, but the work has not been done to indicate the need.

This bill offers a start in that direction. The return on the dollar invested on the other hand also needs work and development. Because day care is labor intensive it produces not only jobs but returns taxes to the treasuries, State and Federal, provides for services and product utilization.

Ultimately, it produces healthy, stable, educated, and fit childen.

Ten years away is 1984. Will we have thwarted a maladjusted view or Orwellian children if we do not provide comprehensive child care—I for one do not think so.

Finally, let me speak as a child care administrator and for many who cannot speak. I operate a child care center for 130 children ages 2 months to 5 years. There are three components: Infant care, foster day care, and day care itself.

Over the last 4 years of operations, I have matured considerably about what child care is all about, and I have aged also. I see in your presented bill a chance to correct some woeful ills now being visited upon quality child care centers. You have heard the many statistics of the country's needs and now specifically the needs of Washington, D.C.

It is believed by many people in Washington that quality care is being provided to all children in all federally funded programs. This is not so. The diverse types of funding affects diversely the type and quality of care provided and received. The so-called slot-funded programs are hurting administratively and programmatically. They cannot long endure without relief and assistance. These programs, sad to say, are being used but are not being developed and funded at comparable rates. Many are excellent programs, but as I indicated above, they cannot long endure. Within another 5 years, many will close down or become specialty programs no longer serving the needs of the many but of the few.

Fragmentation of administration is the next culprit. Many cities, Washington included, need to stabilize the systems of providing care. Private programs must be involved with the local government. Government and programs should coordinate to solve the problems of cash flow. Funding, for example, must be so structured so that moneys are available for usage when needed, not 1 month later. How can valid businesses thrive on such a system?

Funding likewise should be so scheduled as to avoid a break in services.

Administrators of child care programs would like to invite this committee to travel to other areas of the country to see and experience as wisely as you have here, child devleopment programs in action. It is necessary to see that even though this is a practical country that dotes on practical accomplishments like 2 plus 2 equals 4, $e=mc^2$, and A's and B's—that indicate one has been exposed to, learned, and graduated from one level of accomplishment to another—that children 1 through 5 years are also very practical. Their life and experiences that you see here and across Washington, that we call play, is no more than practical, pragmatic development.

It is necessary for legislators to also see and understand that the ability to produce and the concept of production are more important for a 3-year-old child to grasp than is the making of chemical hydrogen. The concept and the development of that concept stays with the child for life. He may, however, forget at some time in life—later in life—the formula for hydrogen.

This committee needs to see our parents coming in to leave their children. Many of these parents are going to tell you of their needs. They will tell you they have worked themselves through high school, obtained a job, and are now paying back, substantially, on the investment of tax moneys provided for child care.

You will see happy children; you will see we are not experimenting with children, and that what children learn with us, they will never lose in I.Q. quizzes and school itself—a sense of personal worth and dignity; a price in life, culture, and country; a knowledge of themselves, family, peers, and academic studies; and finally, the physical strength and guts to get on with the business of life.

We hope this bill continues to so address our country about the needs of children. We support its intent. We would request the committee to be open to our further study and submittal of comments for changes in the bill's structure. We have at heart some practical suggestions regarding eligibility for services, funding, and fee scales. After we have formulated such suggestions, we will present them in writing to the committee.

Thank you for this opportunity to come before you to present our views.

Mr. **Brademas**. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams, for your very useful statement.

Next we shall hear from Margery Boichel.

Ms. **Boichel**. My name is Margery Boichel. I am a member of the board of directors of Washington Preschools, Inc., which we call WPI, on whose behalf I am testifying today.

I am also a former member of the Parent Board and Finance Committee of the Columbia Road Children's Center, an affiliate of WPI, and have thus participated at several levels in that perennial struggle to survive and maintain high-quality services that your much-needed bill, S. 3754, is designed to support.

WPI is very pleased that Senator Mondale and his Subcommittee on Children and Youth have taken this opportunity to get a firsthand look at day care center operations and to include in their hearings testimony from parents and administrators involved in the process of child care, as well as to see the effects on children of a well-run developmental child care facility in Washington.

BRIEF OVERVIEW OF WPI

Washington Preschools, Inc., briefly, is a private, volunteer nonprofit organization that for the past 7 years has been creating, promoting, and supporting early childhood education and child care programs of outstanding quality—programs based on the premise that boys and girls from racially, culturally, and economically diverse backgrounds can learn and be cared for together, to the individual advantage of each child and to the benefit of the community as a whole. Today, WPI helps support five vigorous centers, serving five different areas of Washington, each with its own strong local board. Four of the centers provide full-day child care in addition to early childhood education programs of high quality. The fifth is a cooperative preschool.

WPI has no paid staff and no office; it has the dedication of a number of talented, energetic men and women of differing races and backgrounds committed to the belief that the formative years of a child are crucial to the kind of person he or she will become and thus to the kind of society we will have.

The volunteers of WPI have not been disappointed in their high expectations. We have been continually rewarded by the tremendous dedication of the parents and staffs of our centers, all of which are parent controlled. Each is struggling to maintain creative educational and child care programs for racially, culturally, and economically diverse children in the face of severe financial limitations and continued crises. Parents in all of our centers, whatever their backgrounds, feel that these centers are theirs. The parent boards reflect the makeup of the centers. The curriculums emphasize the growth of each child's identity and try to incorporate his culture into the daily programs of the schools.

WPI EXPERIENCE IS SUPPORTIVE OF S. 3754

The struggles and experience of WPI in organizing and maintaining excellent family-oriented early childhood education and child care centers provides sample evidence to corroborate and support the need for, findings, and purpose of S. 3754, the Child and Family Services Act of 1974. Each WPI center incorporates the principal elements of the bill. Each center provides an educationally excellent family-oriented child development program.

MEETING LOW-INCOME NEEDS

Here at the Capitol East Children's Center, as at the other WPI centers, children of working parents from all across the economic and social spectrum are served.

Their tuition is based on their ability to pay—on a sliding scale from nothing to full tuition. This sliding scale tuition scheme, when combined with indispensable outside funding to cover costs for lower income children, makes possible the socioeconomic diversity—and concomitant expansion of available human resources—so advantageous to the centers' children and to the community's social cohesion.

VARIETY AND FLEXIBILITY

There is flexibility in the scheduling of care given in the centers. Here at Capitol East, some children stay for the morning only, some spend the full day, and some come after a morning public school program. Five children under age 3 are cared for in a home which is a satellite of the center. At two other WPI centers, all of the preschool children attend full-day programs, augmented by some afterschool children. Thus, the centers are able to serve the needs of parents with varying employment situations.

PARENT PARTICIPATION

All WPI centers require and achieve a high degree of parent participation. Parents serve on—in fact, dominate—each center's board of directors and volunteer their services in a variety of other ways: For example, painting, teaching, fundraising, sharing cultural customs and distinctive foods, chaperoning trips. They are actively encouraged to be an integral part of the center. This parent involvement emphasizes and reinforces the family's role in the child's education, helps to provide a family atmosphere at the center, and in a way, helps fill the cultural and emotional gap created by the virtual disappearance of the extended family noted by your subcommittee. Our centers, in truth, belong to the families they serve.

TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

Additionally, the centers provide training opportunities for paraprofessionals. In recruiting potential trainees, we look first to the parent body and then to the neighborhood in the hope of strengthening the knowledge, interest, and skills of those most immediately involved. Some of the aides have climbed the career ladder, while some have also become more confident and competent as parents.

HEALTH SERVICES

Because of the costs involved, health care is provided only on a referral basis or by volunteer social workers, medical aides, and psychiatrists. Some centers have established ongoing relationships with community health facilities such as Children's Hospital.

GOOD PROGRAMS NEED AND DESERVE SUPPORT

WPI applauds the recognition in S. 3754, title I, section 106(b) (14), of the need to give priority consideration to applications for funding ongoing child development programs of public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations. Capitol East, like all of WPI's centers, exists not because of Federal legislation; it exists because the parents needed it and could not wait for Federal legislation. They were not content with available custodial care, but most could not afford anything better. Tremendous effort and sacrifice by many individuals, with modest but indispensable support from WPI, have created this center and maintained the struggle to keep it open.

S. 3754 is urgently needed to assure its future and that of others in similar straits, threatened by lack of support from the public sector for providing these vitally needed public services.

The need for sound developmental day care is great all over the District; we wish there could be many more such centers. In Washington, there are currently an estimated 32,000 children under age 6 whose mothers work and who must somehow be cared for. Currently only 12,000 of these children are scheduled to be in publicly funded day care centers in fiscal year 1975, up from 6,000 in fiscal year 1974; and unhappily, the quality of these centers varies greatly. This figure includes public half-day kindergartens, Head Start, and full-day care.

Many centers are merely custodial situations; a small minority are centers like this one. In the absence of federally funded day care programs, the government of the District of Columbia has recognized the need and made day care a top priority for use of its revenue-sharing funds. This center is one of the two WPI centers funded in part by revenue sharing. But as is obvious from the statistics, the citywide need is only partly met. And there is no assurance that even these funds will be available in the future.

PRIVATE RESOURCES INSUFFICIENT TO MEET THE NEED

This past year, WPI raised $40,000 for its five centers, a substantial sum but only a small fraction of the need of just our five centers alone. As noted, two of its centers receive revenue-sharing funds through the District, and a third has been trying to do so since September 1972. Each revenue sharing-supported center must raise over $20,000 a year in matching funds. The budgets of these centers are barebones, without fat. How are we to retain trained early childhood educators when we are funded at well below the public school salary level? Our center directors earn $11,000 to $12,000 a year and put in 9- and 10-hour days, 12 months a year because they have no money for adequate administrative aid. How can they do it? Many simply burn out and leave after a year or two or feel compelled to resist inflation by shifting to higher paying jobs. Where quality exists, and it does indeed exist, it is maintained out of personal sacrifice, and that is wrong! Early childhood educators are valuable professionals and should be treated as such. They can make a significant impact on the kind of adults our children become.

WPI stands between life and death for its centers. We have the burden of increasing our financial commitment each year, which together with the fund-raising efforts of parents completely supplies the 25-percent matching money required. The District government pays the matching money for most DHR-funded centers, but our superb record of volunteerism has gone completely unrecognized in our request for adequate funding. Neither the city nor the Congress has shown any interest until now in maintaining quality where it already exists. S. 3754 will hopefully remedy this.

REALISTIC FUNDING LEVELS

The child and family services bill is to be commended for mandating a realistic cost per child level, although we feel that there should be some built-in way to deal with cost-of-living increases. The bill also proposes a realistic level of tuition payments, with free care available for families at the lower standard of living budget level.

We would like to question, however, the seeming absolute prohibition contained in title I, section 111(c) against the use of tuition payments—fees for services presumably apply to tuition—toward meeting the matching share. Clearly tuition payments should not be charged families entitled to free or subsidized services; however, centers like those of WPI with a full range of income levels are capable of generating tuition income from families fully able to pay.

If the centers themselves must provide the matching share, it will be extremely difficult to keep up a yearly flow of private contributions sufficient to meet the need for matching funds. Already the few foundations that have supported us more than once have indicated their reluctance to be counted on as a source of matching funds. If the District government could provide the matching funds, however, such public-private cooperation might very well meet the need.

MULTILEVEL COOPERATION DESIRABLE

Another aspect of S. 3754 whose wisdom finds support in WPI experience is in its mandated mechanisms for cooperation among parents, community, local, State, and National Governments. WPI centers have participated in such multilevel cooperation, most notably in a 2-year pilot project at the Columbia Road Children's Center funded by title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act through the District government on a contract basis with the District Board of Education. The project funding was arranged by WPI and carried out by the staff and families of the center.

The proposed policy councils involving parents at all levels is a sound step in the right direction for meaningful public policymaking.

NATIONAL NEEDS

The need for comprehensive high-quality family child care countrywide is also great, as your committee has repeatedly discerned. The prime interest in many existing centers is in making a profit; many others are merely custodial. The smallest number are operated for the best interest of the child and his family.

Yet evidence accumulated by your Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and by others clearly shows that a strong, educationally sound early child development program, offered in the context of a family-oriented day care center—with health and social services—can go far to build family strength and community cohesion. A good center can also help counteract some of the widespread alienation so destructive of social cohesion.

Such a program can also provide millions of children a positive and productive introduction to school and community life and a greatly enhanced possibility for later success—for it is well established that a child's early years are crucially important to his future development. Given the choice, many mothers would prefer to stay at home with their very young children. Personal and economic necessity and the needs of society, however, result in millions of mothers working outside the home. The children of these women should be assured of good care. Continued neglect of this persistent need violates the demands of both equity and efficiency.

The centers sponsored by WPI were created to help lay the groundwork and develop the means to achieve such socially productivce programs as envisaged by S. 3754. But the means to expand such small pilot efforts as ours to meet the national need on a continuing basis are not forthcoming from the private sector alone. We know that Senator Mondale has long been interested in the welfare of the entire family. We hope that with the passage of this comprehensive Child and Family Services Act there will be growing national support for the needs of our young children and their families.

Senator **Mondale**. Thank you.

Next is Miss Rawlings.

Miss **Rawlings**. As usual, the problem of being last is that you sometimes sound repetitious. I do not want to lull anyone to sleep, so I will stick to my testimony.

Senator **Mondale**. We will put the full statement in the record as though read.

Miss **Rawlings**. Would it be OK if I read it rather than speak from the top of my head?

Senator **Mondale**. Proceed.

Miss **Rawlings.** I am glad to see Congressmen out in the actual day care center because so often bills are presented in Congress without actual feelings of firsthand exposure to what they are submitting the proposals for, and to see their involvement is good.

My name is Joyce D. Rawlings and I have two children. One has been through 2 years of day care and the other is now in his last year in day care. I am vice chairman of the National Child Day Care Association's parent policy committee. The parent policy committee is composed of 2 parent representatives and 2 alternates from each of the 15 centers under the umbrella of National Child Day Care Association (NCDA).

The association services 836 families and children in centers. Of these 663 are working mothers, 196 are families receiving public assistance, 142 mothers are in training.

But think of those who could benefit from services offered but because of eligibility guidelines relating to family income are ineligible. Because of the limited numbers of day care facilities those that could afford to pay are also left out. With the rising costs of every day expenses, housing, food, and transportation, how can we realistically say a person makes too much money?

NCDA operates on money from varied sources, some being DHR, HEW, through UPO, in-kind services and various demonstration grants. This multifunding in some ways is good and has its advantages, but has its disadvantages also. One being, taking funds from one program when funds are low for another program, there is a tendency to strain the overall personnel and operations.

True, money does not necessarily mean quality but in order to obtain results worth recognition some noticeable investment has to be made. It seems to me we should be willing to invest money in the most valuable asset we have, our children.

Early quality childhood education should be available to all. You should not have to be almost or in rags to receive it or on the other hand a professional or business executive.

Day care offers a way for mothers to raise their economic conditions above the poverty scale by enabling them to work, obtain training, or further their education. Any and all of these with the peace of mind of knowing that her child is being well taken care of by trained individuals in the area of childhood development and education. She is also able to reinforce the education of her child; emotionally, physically, intellectually, and socially through planned workshops, meetings, individual conferences, and home visits. The benefits of day care to the children are innumerable not only while they are enrolled but as they go to the public schools better equipped with basic cognitive skills and better health.

Quality care should offer services in areas of health, education, nutrition, social services, and parent involvement.

Aside from the economic advantages and advantages to the child, there are also the parents' benefits. Parents, through training sessions, are learning about the budgetary and funding processes, what their children should be learning, regulations governing day care operations, and so forth. Most importantly these training sessions give them or expose them to information to enable them to speak knowledgeably and ask pertinent questions not only in day care but every day life experiences. This strengthens the parents, thus in turn, the community. These parents see changes that should be made and work toward changing conditions for the better. When you raise the level of understanding you raise the level of interest.

Not only the District of Columbia but America as a whole must begin to realize the importance of developmental early childhood education for all. Take a look at European countries and other nations of the world, look at the emphasis they put on their youth and their educational system. I am not saying that we have nothing to offer our children. I am merely saying let us not be satisfied with what is or has been done, let us continue to strive for what can and should be done. When we are in the business of education of children there should be no limitations. That should be No. 1 on our list of priorities. Let us always remember we should all be in this together, parents, teachers and administrative officials.

Some will say and be justified in saying day care wasn't around for me and I survived and my children are not dummies. This may be true because you took an interest in your child beyond providing him with clothes, food and shelter. You possibly gave him support, motivation, encouragement and love.

Let us face it, we cannot all give all of these things because maybe from our life experiences they were not given to us. If the child does not get these things from home there should be somewhere he can get them. Day care offers a vehicle, but as in everything it is not all peaches and cream. There are improvements needed in areas, but some form of developmental day care is better than none at all. And if it is not what is needed or wanted, then it is up to individuals like you, myself and others like myself to bring about the necessary actions.

Those of you who still look upon day care as a babysitting service are very wrong in your thinking. As in everything there are exceptions, but for the most part there can be no comparison of the two. In good day care the child is being taught, not necessarily his ABC's and numbers but how to reason, analyze, and think on his own. The child also learns sequences, the difference between something being small or large, round or square, and social interaction. In other words good day care is preparing the child for learning. The older children do learn their ABC's and numbers. Some may even learn to read depending on their ability and interests. But all children benefit because plans are drawn up to enable each child to reach his highest level of understanding and thinking.

Day care in many cases finds or recognizes learning or physical handicaps and develops ways to correct or strengthen these areas, thereby enabling the child to go to public schools as better students.

By providing necessary screening for hearing, vision, sickle cell, lead poisoning, dental care and developmental tests designed to uncover any disorders that may hinder a child from learning, the child is given a head start. Because if a child is physically and emotionally healthy he is in a better frame of mind for learning.

To close I want to say that so often we as parents say, when we ask who we are, we say I am just a parent, but parents are very important in this process because if it were not for the children of these parents, there would be no need for proposals, money or any legislation or in fact this hearing right here.

For any of you parents in the audience, please be aware of what is happening around you, because you know these are our children and if we do not care, how do we expect congressmen and other officials to care?

Senator **Mondale**. Thank you very much for your fine statement. Can you estimate how many preschool children in the District of Columbia need day care?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. It is estimated that 12,000 to 13,000 preschool children whose mothers are employed are in low-income families and should have free care. Most of these children need full day care. There are also children whose mothers are in work training or who are studying. Part day care is also needed for at least 6,000 preschool children in poverty whose mothers do not work, and who should have developmental opportunities. In addition, very roughly speaking I estimate that there are an equal number of children, about 20,000, who are in families with incomes between $8,000 and $13,000 and who need subsidized care with fees sealed to income.

Senator **Mondale**. So your estimate is that there is something like 25,000 children who need full time day care in preschool or part time day care? About half of these children would have to be fully subsidized because of the poverty of their parents, about half of them could need a partial subsidy based on their ability to contribute?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. I should add one thing to that: 32,000 children was the figure that represented all children under the age of 6 with working mothers.

Senator **Mondale**. The 32,000 preschool children in the District of Columbia whose mothers work?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. Yes. I do not have any figures on how many mothers are in training or students who need it. I had to hazard a guess.

Senator **Mondale**. Would it mean then that about 8,000 or 10,000 of these children belong to families who can pay the full cost of day care, is that what that means?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. I have a table which you might like to have for the record, which I compiled from 1970 D.C. census data, which shows us the number of children under the age of 6 with working parents. About 16 percent of the families had income of over $15,000. About a quarter of the children were in families above the $13,000 income level—the intermediate budget level. Thus about three quarters of the families need free or subsidized care.

Senator **Mondale**. Now, of that estimated need then, how much of it is being met with any kind of day care?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. Mr. Yeldell, the director of Human Resources Department, in a recent statement to the City Council said that the city was funding 6,700 day care slots. I hate the word "slots," but it is in use.

Senator **Mondale**. Would that be part time as well as full time?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. Yes. Part time and full time for preschoolers and before and after school for school-aged children. Prekindergarten care as part of the school system is separate. DHR funds, on a purchase of service basis, care for 3,700 children. About half of them are cared for in their homes; about 700 in family day care homes, and the rest in centers. The other 3,000 "slots" would be in the revenue-sharing day care centers. These revenue-sharing centers include those run by the Recreation Department for about 450 children.

Then there are Head Start programs for about 1,500 children. About 1,100 of those children are in part day programs and that is not day care in the sense we are speaking of. So that we have DHR funded care, and Head Start, and then we have a small amount of money in the school system for about 60 additional prekindergarten part day classes for about 1,200 children.

Senator MONDALE. Is it equivalent to day care centers?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. No. These classes are in session from 9 to 12 in the morning, or from 1 to 3 in the afternoon. They are mainly for 4-year-olds. They are not for 3-year-olds. Five-year-olds are theoretically in kindergarten.

Senator MONDALE. Do we have citywide kindergarten programs in the District?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. We do not have universal attendance. It is not compulsory.

Senator MONDALE. Approximately what age is served in kindergarten?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. Most are age 5. The prekindergarten classes are limited 2- or 3-hour programs. This is the only preschool program that has no eligibility requirements and no fees, so that it reaches children of all income groups.

Senator MONDALE. You have all of these programs working separately?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. Absolutely separately.

Senator MONDALE. Is there any coordinating committee that meets? Is there anything to coordinate the kindergarten, Head Start, private, voluntary, Department of Health? How can we put it all together?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. Some years ago the Department of Human Resources was pressed by those of us who are fighters for kids for coordination of day care and for day care planning. An Office of Child Development was set up. It has a rather large staff, but it has done virtually nothing in the field of coordination and planning.

Senator MONDALE. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This office this year, Senator, has been turned into a planning office for providing technical assistance to childhood programs. That was supposed to have happened the months of June, July, and August. To date that has not happened at all.

Senator MONDALE. How big is the budget for that office? Do you have any idea?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I do not know.

Senator MONDALE. In any event, that could have been the coordinating office?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

Senator MONDALE. But it has not done that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Senator MONDALE. Have you sought to encourage it to do so?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, we have. In testimony before the House and the Senate for the District budget we submitted testimony with reference to that.

Senator MONDALE. What did they say?

Mr. **Williams**. Their testimony indicated that this was forthcoming, that it had been planned, that it was going to happen. Nothing has happened over the last 2 years of budgeting.

Various types of programs exist in the city, have existed on an emergency basis for the past few months, and are still on an emergency basis now. It has urged the District to put children in what we call slots, and we think it is a dirty word, sorry to say, simply to meet the need of not having to puzzle with us, the people and you, the Congress.

The Department has no idea of what is happening in many of the programs that they are putting children into. There are two monitors, and I have seen one of the monitors once over the last year, who stayed 20 minutes in our program, and left telling me that we needed one plug on the wall to be out of reach of children. That is the extent of what they are doing.

I think what the crucial issue is in terms of programing is that there is no coordination, there is no one person to grasp the fullness of what programs are doing, and how to work with them.

Senator **Mondale**. The statistical basis is very bad, is it not? This is one thing the office could be finding out just what is this thing going to cost, what are the hard numbers. There is no reason why there should be such mystery.

Mrs. **Keyserling**. I cannot tell you how many days and how many phone calls it has taken me to produce the figures which I have given you here this morning. I am also the Chairman of the District of Columbia Commission on the Status of Women. We have set up a task force on day care on which I am active. We are trying to prepare a report on day care needs to go to the Mayor to put some of these problems to him, clearly and simply and directly, and so I have really been persistent.

I have a record of as many as 26 phone calls to get 1 figure. Then we found we did not have it right. Even as late as 6 o'clock last night, we were trying to get those school system figures straightened out.

Senator **Mondale**. In addition to lack of coordination, there is no enforcement of day care standards either, is there?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. There is, theoretically. In the Department of Human Resources we have a Standards and Licensing Division. There is a day care code. That code compares very unfavorably, however, to the codes of other cities such as New York or Baltimore.

There are no educational requirements for staff. The standards relate basically to the physical facilities, to the fire and minimum health requirements.

Senator **Mondale**. We have money going in here under title IV–A, although none of it is being used for day care. They are using revenue-sharing money, but they pay no attention then to the Federal interagency day care requirement.

Mrs. **Keyserling**. In fact, no. Because the Department of Human Resources is willing to put as many as 1,478 children in day care centers at fees of $20 a week. Almost 165 are private centers, many of which do not meet the interagency requirements.

Senator **Mondale**. What does it cost per child in your association's day care centers?

Mrs. **Keyserling**. About $42 a week, on the average.

Senator **Mondale**. Forty-two?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. A week, roughly.

Senator MONDALE. We will get into that.

Mrs. KEYSERLING. That does not include separate money we get for two special education programs, and for our early and periodic screening diagnosis and treatment program. This is simply the average cost of our regular preschool and our afterschool programs.

Senator MONDALE. Are these some of the better day care centers?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. These are among the best in the city. I mentioned earlier I have recently completed a study of day care for the mayor of New York. You might be interested to know that New York City is spending over $70 a week per child for day care, including full day and part day. This is the average for the city.

Senator MONDALE. Do any of you care to comment on the question I have asked?

Miss BOICHEL. In terms of cost per child, they are not the same in each of our centers. There are variations from center to center. I think on the basis of a very, very rough average, it works out to something like $2,000 a year, which is higher than some, and lower than some. It is too low, really. But that is a misleading figure I think.

In two of our centers, we have children coming for the morning only, especially educational programs.

Senator MONDALE. Anything else?

Mrs. KEYSERLING. Back in 1970 the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in testimony before one of your Senate committees, included a number of figures as to what the cost was 4 years ago of center care, of what they called acceptable and desirable quality. Acceptable quality care is what we should be talking about, if we are not talking about desirable quality; acceptable care was then $2,348, according to the Bureau.

If you adjust that for the Cost of Living Index, which I have done since 1970, the cost of acceptable care now would be $2,940 a year, which is $52 a week.

I wanted to put that in for the record.

[The information referred to follows:]

WASHINGTON COMMITTEE FOR DAY CARE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 17, 1973.

Some questions and answers about developmental day and child care services in the Washington area:

Question. How many children in Washington, D.C. from low-income families are eligible for day care services?

Answer. The Department of Public Welfare has estimated (Washington Post, November 10, 1972) that there are 25,000 low-income children in Washington. (All ages) The Commerce Department, Bureau of the Census, gives these figures: (All income groups)

	Number children
1 year old	12, 550
2 years old	11, 220
3 years old	11, 815
4 years old	12, 601
5 years old	12, 696
3 to 5 years old total	37, 112

Source: PC(1)–B10 Table 19, 1970 Data.

Of the 163,482 families in D.C. 24,429 have incomes less than $3,999, and 55,062 have incomes less than $6,999. (Source: PC(1)–C10, Table 57, 1970 Data.)

In order to make the mathematics simple, and develop a conservative estimate of the number of children eligible for day care, WCDC will assume an equal distribution of children across the income distribution. This results in a total of 1 child to every 6.7, or 15%, would be from families with income less than $3,999—or 5,567 children. Approximately 1 in every 3 children, using this assumption, comes from a family with income less than $6,999—or 12,556 children. (Income less than $7,000 is being considered one of the eligibility "cut-off" points.)

WCDC estimates that there are more than 7,000 income-eligible children in Washington, D.C. (This estimate is above the lowest figure given above since the Census Bureau is now estimating an error in the data on low-income and minority population information.)

Question. Why does day care cost more per child than it costs for schoolage children?

Answer. Day and child care services have a longer day (8–9 hours), and operate full-year. Additionally, day care facilities have more rigorous upkeep and other requirements than those in effect for other education systems.

Question. Has the District of Columbia developed and implemented any system to determine the quality of day care in this area?

Answer. Despite verbal assurances that quality care measures have been developed and implemented, WCDC has yet to be provided with copies of written materials about those measures. WCDC member providers report that the quality of their day care is more a matter of parent-staff development and concern than of any DHR guidelines. WCDC providers come from several "schools" in terms of day care practices: some are Open Classroom oriented, some use Montessori methods, some use other procedures. In each case, of course, quality care is defined somewhat differently. Thus, the problem of defining quality care is more complex than the simple statement of the question implies. To date, DHR has not responded to these differences, either.

Question. What is the role of citizens, parents, day care providers, and others in developing plans for future DHR and communitywide day care facilities, objectives, and such?

Answer. DHR has an Advisory Board which is selected by that agency. For the most part, this group does not receive information ahead of public announcement, and for the most part this is not seen as "community participation" by people in Washington. Little is generally known about when this group meets, what it can and cannot do, how one gets onto the group, etc.

WCDC would like to see a more open forum developed. This would be one in which the providers are represented, parents are represented, child advocates are represented, DHR is represented. . . . We would like to see this forum meet regularly. We would like this forum to have plan development and review powers. We would like this forum to have prior access to proposed budgets, and a role in developing such budgets.

Question. Is there any estimate of the net cost to the taxpayer of day care services in terms of the number of parents who, with such services, return to work or otherwise shift from welfare, food stamps, and other federal and local support to self-sufficiency?

Answer. WCDC sees this as one of many areas in which DHR has a more acceptable role than that of attempting to replace present day care providers by operating the systems itself. WCDC suggests that a better and more comprehensive sense of priorities could be established if cost estimates like these were developed.

For example: Data from Montgomery County indicates that there are 200 working, welfare-potential mothers whose 332 children are subsidized in day care centers. According to the Montgomery County Sentinel (April 30, 1973), "If these women earn an average of $100 weekly, their annual federal income taxes would total about $120,000, their state taxes $30,000. At the same time, should these women and their dependent children become welfare recipients, they would be sent monthly checks amounting to about $452,000. This figure does not include fringe benefits such as medical assistance, food stamps, school lunches, etc. In 1972 all day care programs to such families in Montgomery County cost $312,884.82."

What does this kind of data mean?

Simply that instead of spending $452,000 for welfare per year (we believe that "monthly" is a typo) the state receives over $100,000. If we add the taxes to the welfare payments to get a net savings, we get $602,000. If we then deduct the $312,900 expense for day care, we get a net saving to the government and the taxpayer of $289,116 for 200 families.

Day care is a smashing bargain in terms of dollar alone.

Question. There is some discussion in DHR of paying day care centers on a "slotting" basis. What is "slotting"?

Answer. Slotting payments are those made on the basis of daily attendance. Thus, if a 5 year old group had an enrollment of 20 students—the maximum permissable—and all 20 students attended every session, the full (contracted) payment would be made to the center. If, however, some children get sick and miss attendance, the payment to the center would be correspondingly reduced.

WCDC does not see slotting as an acceptable method for determining payments to centers. We cannot pay our rent on a slotting basis. We cannot pay our staffs on a slotting basis. We cannot pay our insurance on a slotting basis. (Neither, for that matter, are DHR management personnel—like Mr. Yeldell—paid on the basis of the number of employees showing up for work each day!)

WCDC is not sure what problem the slotting method of payments is intended to resolve, but suggests that both the problem and the solution might be better understood.

Question. Have all of the possibilities for expanding the number of children in day care facilities in the District of Columbia been explored?

Answer. Obviously not.

WCDC is looking into the developing movement among labor rank-and-file and leadership to include in their contract provisions with management provisions for the day and child care needs of the workers. The Amalgamated Butcher Workers, for example, have such provisions in some of their contracts in Baltimore, Maryland, and the American Federation of Teachers in New York City have several contracts providing for day care for their children. Several Federal agencies, like HEW, now have well publicized day care centers in operation for their employees.

WCDC suggests that DHR should look carefully at this emerging pattern to determine what role it might play in assisting these day care centers and in ensuring high quality in those centers.

One of the problems for many day care providers is that of locating acceptable spaces for their services. While it is true that some of the schools and public spaces in other facilities—like the libraries—are now well utilized, it is equally true that some schools are not overcrowded and could be made into good spaces for day care services. The problem is to identify those spaces, determine what legal limitations might preclude day care use, and, where possible, move to use these spaces for the provision of day care to our children. DHR could clearly spearhead this effort, since it has a large staff available to it and most other groups, including WCDC, do not.

Other possibilities, too, need to be explored. DHR should explore the possibility of creating a Child Advocacy project—like those in Los Angeles and Chicago.

Many questions regarding the legal rights of children need to be explored and clarified. The health rights of children, including those not participating in day care centers, need to be examined.

The problems of care for the younger child, from birth to "normal" child care age, needs to be evaluated.

The relationships between the child care programs, preschool programs, and school programs need to be examined; are children from these programs more "ready" for school, do they have a broader range of learning skills than others, etc.?

Question. Is there in Washington any model used by day and child care providers or DHR which indicates the "optimum" staffing levels, size of centers, budgets, activities, and such?

Answer. DHR is rumored to be developing such a model and appears to be using the outlines of such a model at this time. WCDC has also worked on the development of a budget model useful to our member agencies as a costing guide in terms of teacher salaries, other staffing costs, materials, expendibles, and such.

WCDC's model is still in the developmental stage, and has been neither approved nor accepted by all of our member agencies. Some portions of the budget—i.e. salaries for directors, fringe benefits packages for employees—are being debated at this time.

Optimum center size is clearly being seen as groupings of at least three classes—one 3 year old, one 4 year old, one five year old, for example (approximately 50 children)—as a more cost effective and efficient use of personnel than smaller center sizes. Increments appear to be in units of three or four classes per center facility, though there is not complete agreement within WCDC on this as yet.

Development of these criteria should clearly be one of the many areas in which WCDC, other providers, DHR, parent groups, teacher groups, child advocates, and other concerned community groups should get together and discuss. WCDC encourages consideration by DHR of such an open forum, and for development of these and other facts and opinions about day and child care.

The Washington Committee for Day Care has been working on the development of a formula for the evaluation of the net value in dollars which day care service expenditures in the District of Columbia provide. As a part of this effort, an estimated—but incomplete as will be seen—Government Transfer Payments schedule for an example center (presently in operation) has been tabulated.

Several notes about the data should be understood:

(1) The figures given in terms of the number of parents who have moved from receiving welfare and public assistance support to regular employment and who, in assessing the impact of the closing of the present center feel they could find alternative day care services is an understatement of the actual number reporting they might have to quit work in order to attend to their children.

(2) The number of parents in the "example center" who earn more than $7,000 per year is a deliberate overstatement: we know of no center which operates on an even basis in terms of children from low income and middle and high income homes. Again, we have projected this figure in order to provide a clear understatement of the actual Transfer Payments results.

(3) As note (2), *every number, every consideration, every dollar estimate is deliberately on the conservative side of the real situation.* We have done this in order to avoid any implication of an overstatement or misleading result.

(4) The data provided is incomplete in the sense that direct center cost figures, taxes on those items, and the application of more sophisticated "multipliers," has not been developed. It should be noted that every one of these considerations tends to make the data more dramatic in the sense that dollar for dollar Transfer figures would probably tend toward a return of more than $1 for every dollar provided.

A more comprehensive development of the data, including utilization of more sophisticated statistical techniques and designation of source for justification of each technique is now underway. The Washington Committee for Day Care has limited resources to make available to this task, however, and expects that this task will take some time to complete. (See note 5, below)

(5) *WCDC cautions against the drawing of any but the most careful and reasoned conclusions from this data.* All data cited is presently undergoing analysis by professional economists, who are being asked to help assess the implications of the data, the limitations of the data, and such.

ESTIMATED GOVERNMENT TRANSFER PAYMENTS

The cost to the District of Columbia and the Federal Governments of closing one day care center:

Assumptions:

(1) Fully operating 50 child day care centers,

(2) Funding for center set at $135,000 per year, ($2,700 per child), 75% from Government, $101,250. 25% local share (from community), $33,750.

(3) Center staff, facilities, and the children served meet requirements of appropriate legislation in the District of Columbia, EXCEPT (see notes 2 and 3) that deliberate conservatism of data and understatement of effects of center closing considerations apply.

Staff

(1) Eight jobs lost for an average of five months. Estimated by teachers and staff:

Federal payroll taxes lost, approximately 15 percent per year	$12,269
D.C. taxes lost, approximately 5 percent per year	4,090
Total	16,359

Five months is 5/12 of year, 5/12 multiplied by $16,359 equals $6,816.

Staff would seek unemployment after one month off work, or for an average of four months per person. This totals $17,600.

(2) Three staff would return to public support.
Welfare would be approximately $7,200.
Food stamps would be approximately $2,200.
Direct staff payments or tax losses equals $33,816.

B. Parents

Group 1: 24 parents earning less than $7,000 per year, 20 are single parent families.

Group 2: 26 parents from families earning more than $7,000, 23 families with both parents working.

Group 1

A. 60% of single parents would have to return to homes to care for children. This comes to 12 parents, all eligible for public assistance (most or all having come from such assistance prior to opening of center). Welfare would cost $28,800, food stamps $8,640.

These 12 parents now pay taxes on their job incomes. Assume average income is $5,000.

Federal taxes stopped	$9,000
DC taxes stopped	3,000
Total	12,000

B. Remaining 12 parents would find alternative services.

Group 2

A. Ten parents, now working, would have to return to home to care for children, 40% of total. (Higher income families have, or seem to have, a slightly easier time identifying and being accepted for services.)

Federal taxes stopped	$7,500
DC taxes stopped	2,500
Total	10,000

B. Thirteen parents would find alternative services. (60%).
C. Three parents not working would care for children in home.

Government transfer payments for closing center:

A.	$33,816
B. 1A	37,440
	12,000
B. 2	10,000
Total	93,256

Tentative Conclusion, pending completion of analysis.

A day care center receiving $101,250 per year from the government provides services, employment, and pays taxes which otherwise cost, in direct dollars, $93,256. This does not include any cost-benefit analysis of the services provided, the effects and benefits for the children, and other genuine considerations. The net cost for providing day care to 50 children is $7,994, or $159.88 per child-year.

DAY CARE AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A COST COMPARISON

There has been extensive discussion between child care advocates and school authorities over the "high costs" of child care compared to public school expenses. It has been the usual procedure during this controversy to take the reported per pupil expenses of the school system, some $1,225 in FY 74 and increasing this year, and the reported per pupil costs of child care, $2,780 in FY 74 and $2,400 in FY 75, and proclaim that child care is somehow much, much more expensive than it ought to be.[1]

The notion of being less efficient, more costly than the public schools is not a pleasant one: public education is not considered to be a model of efficiency or cost-effectiveness by even the loosest standards.

---

[1] Sources materials for budget figures are the following unless otherwise noted:
(a) Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 93rd Congress, Parts 1 and 2, Government Printing Office: 1973. Hereinafter referred to as "Hearings."
(b) Capitol East Children's Center Funding Proposal, 1973. Available from CECC at 5th and C Streets, NE., Washington, D.C. 20002. Hereinafter referred to as "CECC."

This paper discusses the relative costs of both child care and public school education, and suggests a rough method for comparing costs which is responsive to the differences between the programs. Because it is the intent of this paper to develop an analysis of the *relative* costs of both programs, there has been a conscious attempt to make the mathematics of the comparison simple. The results, therefore should be viewed not as specific dollars, but as comparative measures.

PROGRAM DIFFERENCES

There are substantial differences between child care—for children from 3 to 5 years old—and education for older children. By law, regulation, and practice, child care services require more teachers per class for a longer day for a longer year than public school programs provide. The following brief points may be instructive:

1. The goals and objectives (and priorities) of the public schools are these:[2]

(*a*) "To raise significantly the level of academic achievement of all students in the areas of reading, written and oral communications, and mathematics.

(*b*) "To expand radically all full-time programs for children with severe handicaps and learning disabilities.

(*c*) "To strengthen and expand career development programs for all students.

(*d*) "To maintain and strengthen noneducational services which are vital in the support of a quality educational program."

The goals and objectives of many child care centers include the following:[3] (digested from sources)

(*a*) Fulfill the need for a warm, personal day care environment.

(*b*) Provide quality preschool education.

(*c*) Offer an "extended" (hours) program for children of working parents and others.

(*d*) Involve parents and other members of the community as integral participants in the daily operations of and on-going development of programs.

(*e*) Provide a total learning experience within the community which can effect and be reflected within the public schools of that community.

It should be clear that the differences in goals are directly reflected in the kinds of services, the hours, and the means and ends provided by each program. Child care is not intended to be, nor is it considered as simply pre-school or early first grade education. Neither is it another Headstart attempt.

2. Pupil-teacher ratios average approximately 25:1 in the public schools[4] and 7:1 in the Centers.[5] In order to comply with child care regulations, it would be necessary to increase the number of teachers by 25 divided by 7, or 35.7%.

3. Public schools operate for 6½ hours per day; the Centers for 10½ hours. Public schools would have to remain open 10.5 divided by 6.5 times present hours to meet child care requirements.

4. Public schools are open for an "average" 40 week year for teaching staff; child care centers are open 52 weeks per year (both take similar holidays, but there is no summer recess for child care programs). Since it is the teachers who are the bulk of those who are "off" during the summer, their costs would have to be increased by 52 divided by 40 to meet child care teachers' costs. Teachers in the public school system use approximately 65% of the public school budget.[6]

5. There are, obviously, other considerations: child care facilities must meet different standards for their facilities, the kinds of food provided, play spaces and such. Teachers in child care programs do not have parity with those in the public schools in terms of salaries, hours, benefits, vacations, "tenure", union membership, and such and are in almost every instance less well off than their peers in the public schools. Because these are rather more difficult to compute, we have chosen to ignore their input: given the lack of parity and the results of previous considerations alone, the purpose of relative cost comparisons is not ill-served by this action.

THE MATHEMATICS

It is suggested that a comparison between public school costs and child care program costs can be made more relevent by consideration of the conditions under which each is expected, and does, operate. Thus, if the public school budget is used as a "base" number, and additions and subtractions are made to that figure dependent on differences between public school and child care hours, weeks, and such, a figure can be approximated which represents the costs to the public school of operating a program physically similar to that now provided by child care centers. The method is admittedly inexact, but should suffice to show comparative costs.

---

[2] *Hearings*, part 2, pp. 130–131.

[3] *Capitol East Children's Center: Discussion Paper.* Available from CECC. Dated 1970.

[4] *Hearings*, part 2, p. 179.

[5] *CECC*, p. 24.

[6] *Hearings*, part 2, p. 205.

The following mathematic steps can be taken for the computation:

1. Base numbers in each system are these:

(*a*) The public school budget is $167,000,000.

(*b*) There are 136,400 students in the public schools.

(*c*) Average cost per student, then is $167,000,000 divided by 136,400 equals $1,225. This is also equal to Board of Education estimates.[7]

(*d*) In FY 74, children's centers spent between $2,780 and $2,400 per child.[8]

2. If we take 65% of the school budget, we have the amount of the budget spent each year on teachers: 0.65 multiplied by $167,000,000 equals $108,550,000.

3. If we increase the active teaching portion of the school year from 40 weeks to 52 weeks, we would have to hire new teachers at the going rate, or increase salaries proportionately. In either case, we would have to increase the teachers' budget as follows: 52 divided by 40 multiplied by $108,550,000 equals $141,115,000. This is the cost of teachers for the child care year.

4. If we now increase the number of teachers to change from the present 25:1 teacher-pupil ratio to the child care required 7:1, we get the following: 25 divided by 7 multiplied by $141,115,000 equals $503,982,130.

5. If we want to compute the approximate non-teacher costs for the public schools:

Total budget	$167, 000, 000
Teachers' salaries, etc. Step 2	—108, 550, 000
Total	58, 450, 000

6. If we assume that non-teacher costs remain the same(an obvious simplification) and want now to determine the full costs of a public school child care program:

Teacher costs, Step 4	$503, 982, 130
Other costs, Step 5	+58, 450, 000
Total	562, 412, 130

This represents the cost for public schools of increasing their working day to 10½ hours, their working weeks to 52.

7. If we divide the total budget by the number of childen served we get the cost per pupil:

$562,412,130 divided by 136,400 equals $4,123.

The comparative costs, then of operating a public school child care program which meets child care regulations in terms of time of service provided only, indicate that it would cost some $4,000 for the public schools to do what the private, non-profit community groups are doing for $2,400 to $2,780.

This discussion has deliberately avoided those areas of concern that include *quality* of care offered, *objectives* of the programs, *diversity* in delivery models, and such. These are all valid considerations, but are rightfully the subject of other papers.

Senator MONDALE. Would it be fair to say that most of the day care centers are involved in providing care for the children of a parent, or parents, who are working? So that in addition to the need of providing decent developmental day care for people who must work, or wish to work, there is another great problem out there with children who are growing up with great deficits, problems, difficulties, disadvantages. Would it be fair to say that that problem—what I call the cheated children—is largely being unmet in the District of Columbia?

---

[7] *Hearings,* part 2, p. 205.

[8] *CECC,* p. 24. *Hearings,* part 2, pp. 797–799.

Mrs. **Keyserling.** Yes you can say largely. However, Head Start has an income eligibility level so low that it does not reach many working mothers.

Senator **Mondale.** They are only taking 1,500 children?

Mrs. **Keyserling.** They have about 1,500. They are really below the poverty level; below a hard poverty level.

Senator **Mondale.** Would not many of those parents having children in Head Start be working?

Mrs. **Keyserling.** Some would.

Miss **Rawlings.** Or in training.

Mrs. **Keyserling.** In most of our centers we have some parents who are not working, and are certified by the Department of Human Resources as being eligible because the mother may be in work-training, may be a student, may have a history of nervous breakdowns, or family stress.

Mr. **Williams.** We have one preliminary study done back in 1972 that indicates there are about 7,000 children in the city that have not had adequate care of notable type. They are people placed in unlicensed centers, some who are in unlicensed homes.

We hope that somehow we would be able to validate these statistics, but we find that [illegible] children are the children who are proposed to us as sometimes children who need to be in care who are on waiting lists throughout the city.

Senator **Mondale.** Thank you very much.

I would like to ask a lot more questions, but we have a lot of witnesses.

Thank you very much.

Our next panel is a panel of staff members from Capitol East Children's Center, Gloria Panton, center director, and Shari Ostrow, teacher.

STATEMENT OF GLORIA PANTON, CENTER DIRECTOR, CAPITOL EAST CHILDREN'S CENTER, ACCOMPANIED BY SHARI OSTROW, TEACHER

Ms. **Panton.** Senator Mondale and members of the committee and staff, welcome to Capitol East.

I am amazed that you could come here this morning to see the center and visit with us, and really see what the day care center is.

My name is Gloria Panton, and I have been the director of Capitol East Children's Center (CECC) since its founding in September 1970. The children's center was established by a group of parents in this area who felt the need for a high quality flexible program that could cater to all racial and economic levels.

The backgrounds of these people were diverse, but they all wanted to establish a high quality program in a warm and supportive environment. Some of these people had no alternative but to work. Others wanted a flexible program that would allow them to accept part-time employment, or wanted a multiculture, multiethnic, multiracial experience for their children.

Today the center serves an economically, racially, socially, and culturally diverse group of 55 children and their families year round.

That the center exists today is due to the high level of involvement and long hours put in by parents and staff. If anyone can tell about the struggle for a day care center to exist without public funding, I can. I worked with this center for almost 2 years before any public funding was received. It was hard. It took effort, our energy, our time and our sweat. It took long hours of both working parents and newly hired staff. An eight-hour day for a staff member was rare, and parents who had demanding jobs came in after work and helped. We all worked on weekends. We painted the rooms, made furniture and painted them, and set up the classrooms.

Parents paid tuition on a sliding scale based on income but no one could afford to pay the full cost of what it was to run the kind of high quality program we wished to be associated with. So staff members used their own money from their already low salaries to help buy materials.

Despite these acute financial difficulties we finished the first quarter with a deficit of $6,000, and the first year with a deficit of $24,000. How was this accomplished, you may ask? It was not easy. We sponsored bake sales, rock dances and cabarets.

As a matter of fact, for the first year we had three such dances. After a while people in the community started to avoid us because we were always selling tickets for another rock dance. We were beginning to lose our friends, so we had to look elsewhere. We went to the foundations, but very few of them were interested in day care, so our efforts met with very little success.

In the meantime, our contract negotiations for title IV–A funding with District of Columbia Department of Human Resources was slowly dragging along. We first submitted a proposal in March of 1970, and the center was opened in September in hopes that funding would be available soon, but it took almost 2 years to obtain a contract. It was very frustrating for all concerned, and took a lot of leg work from already overburdened parents and staff to accomplish this.

However, the commitment and extraordinary efforts of families, community members, and staff connected with the center has meant survival and success. CECC is recognized locally and nationally because of its high quality program. But let us face it, we could not continue giving and working at the rate we started.

True, we were much younger and more energetic, but I have been with the program for 4 years, and I am now exhausted. I should not be, because I love this work, and I enjoy working with people; but giving so much in the first 2 years has left me both frustrated and exhausted. Parents are also at the same stage. The kind of effort has drained their energy. But still they continue to give of themselves as I do. I do not think we could be associated with this center if we were not such hard workers.

In its 4 years of existence, CECC has met, and even surpassed the objectives of its founders.

To establish a program that would foster all aspects of the child's growth, providing a rich and stimulating environment, and helping the child to acquire a positive self image, and to achieve his or her optimum development.

To involve parents as integral contributors to the daily operation and continuing development of the center.

To serve as a model community center whose experience and methods would be valuable and instructive both locally and nationally.

To develop a multicultural curriculum that exposes children to an exploration of other cultures as well as their own.

As the Christian Science Monitor puts it, and I quote:

> A center like the Capital East illustrates what enlightened day care can be. There the ratio of adult staff to children meets the national standards: for 3-year-olds, for instance, there is one adult to every five children; for 4-year-olds, one adult to every seven . . . At Capital East the adults are not just motherly babysitters, as they are in some centers. They are teachers trained in early childhood education, men and women with degrees and experience.

CECC recognizes that the ages 1 through 7 are the most crucial years of a child's life, and seeks out teachers who are highly committed to our philosophy. Teachers who recognize that children should be actively involved in their learning and that they learn through their bodies. This kind of teacher is intensely involved with the children in all they do.

We recognize that working with children is intense work. It is exhaustive, and teachers need time off to get away from the pressures of the classrooms and the playground and to develop their skills.

However, day care is year round and runs for 11 to 12 hours a day. So money should be provided for substitutes to allow each staff member 22 working days per year of annual leave and 12 sick days. This would require two substitute teachers, one substitute assistant teacher and two substitute aides each, for a total of 1 month for the entire year. Yet only about one-half of the money we need is available for this purpose.

At Capitol East we have a very lean budget. Every available community resource is utilized. We use the visiting nurse association for health education, a child psychiatrist volunteers his time for consulting with staff. I assume several roles here; social worker, parent coordinator, nutritionist, as well as Director of the Center. Our teachers are social workers as well as teachers, yet our annual cost per child is approximately $2,500.

In spite of all our efforts, CECC continues to have an annual deficit of $10,000. We are only funded for 30 of our 55 children. The other parents pay on a sliding tuition scale beginning at $10 per week. It is very difficult for parents who earn $7,000, or $8,000, or $9,000, or even up to $15,000 a year to pay the full cost of day care. Some assistance should be provided so that the best quality day care program can be provided for all parents who have to go out and earn a living. We insist that parents who work all day to make ends meet must have more than a play pen to store their children while they work. They need a high quality day care program. But we can only serve 55 children.

What about the thousands of other children? Where are they? And why are they not in programs that will foster their growth and development? These are the crucial years, and some of these children are being maimed for life.

All this takes money and requires an adequately paid qualified staff. It takes much more than $1,800 per year per child. It requires a minimum of $2,500 for larger centers of 50 or more children, and much more if you run a smaller center.

Day care needs to be rescued from its position as step child which it has held since its inception after the Second World War, to its rightful place where it can be recognized for its importance. Good child care legislation that provides for some financial assistance for lower middle income parents will accomplish this.

I sincerely trust that a bill like the one you are proposing, Mr. Senator, will get passed and hasten the dawn of a new day for child care.

Thank you.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you.

Shari, I have read your statement. I will put it in the record following your testimony.

We will now get right down to questions.

What percentage of the parents whose children are here pay the fees into the program?

Ms. PANTON. About half of the children are on sliding scale.

Senator MONDALE. About half of them are free?

Ms. PANTON. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. It costs about $2,500 each year?

Ms. PANTON. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. Do you have a backlog of applicants?

Ms. PANTON. Constantly. We still have a backlog, a waiting list.

Ms. OSTROW. I would say calls come every day.

Senator MONDALE. There is a tremendous demand based upon requests. Now, are all your children preschool?

Ms. PANTON. Three through five.

Ms. OSTROW. Some are old enough to be in kindergarten.

Senator MONDALE. You do not have part time school——

Ms. PANTON. We do take siblings after school.

Senator MONDALE. Do you charge for that?

Ms. PANTON. Because we do not have facilities for after school care, we limit it just to siblings of children who are enrolled in all the programs.

Senator MONDALE. Do you find that because you must depend upon fees in part to swing the cost of this program you must necessarily prefer children from parents who can pay, rather than children who cannot?

Ms. PANTON. We try to keep it balanced between the two. The Center was set up so there was a good balance economically, so for the children who are not eligible for the funding, we try to get parents who can pay, and it is evenly divided among income.

Senator MONDALE. Do any parents pay full costs themselves?

Ms. PANTON. No. It is almost up there.

Senator MONDALE. Are there parents who are better able to pay for day care because of the child care tax deduction of working mothers? Does that help at all?

Ms. PANTON. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. That has been of some help to you?

Ms. OSTROW. According to what parents have said, yes.

Senator MONDALE. Now, what are you licensed as?

Ms. PANTON. We are licensed for 55 children—do you mean how many children?

Senator MONDALE. No—yourself, your professional background.

Ms. PANTON. I have a masters' in early childhood education.

Senator **Mondale**. Where did you get that?

Ms. **Panton**. Howard University.

Ms. **Ostrow**. I have a master's in early childhood at Buffalo, N.Y.

Senator **Mondale**. Are most of the staff here trained?

Ms. **Panton**. Yes. We have a career development program, where we try to encourage our staff to make use of available training programs in addition to what we give them, and this year we have just promoted two assistants to the position of teachers. They have done a good deal of course work at the college level during the 4 years since they have been with us, and they are continuing working toward their degree.

For that we consider an accomplishment.

Senator **Mondale**. Do you use parents at all as voluntary workers, as paraprofessionals?

Ms. **Panton**. Certainly, many as volunteers. Some of them do come in, and those who can take time off, work with us, come in during the days, but unfortunately, because most parents work, it is very difficult to get them to come in to the part of the day when we need them. But they do come in for lunchtimes, playground watch, and during afternoon playground supervision.

Senator **Mondale**. Do you get free rent here?

Ms. **Panton**. No.

Senator **Mondale**. What do you pay?

Ms. **Panton**. We pay $400 a month for rent, plus electricity.

Senator **Mondale**. This is paid to the school system?

Ms. **Panton**. Yes.

Ms. **Ostrow**. Yes; for three classrooms, and the use of the office.

Senator **Mondale**. Yet there apparently is available space here, or they would not be letting you rent?

Ms. **Panton**. Yes. When we moved in, there was unused space.

Ms. **Ostrow**. We have to move out now.

Senator **Mondale**. You are getting evicted?

Ms. **Ostrow**. Yes. We have had a hard time of it.

Ms. **Panton**. We are being offered space in another school, nearby——

Senator **Mondale**. Same rent?

Ms. **Panton**. Yes. It is just transferring of our bodies over to the other location.

Senator **Mondale**. Now you are getting revenue-sharing money?

Ms. **Panton**. Revenue-sharing money.

Senator **Mondale**. How much do you get a year?

Ms. **Panton**. Approximately $61,000, that is what we get. It would probably go up to about $65,000 this year.

Senator **Mondale**. Do you get any other public funds?

Ms. **Panton**. We get some reimbursement from the special food service program.

Senator **Mondale**. Do you get any bilingual, bicultural money?

Ms. **Panton**. We are trying to.

Senator **Mondale**. It seems to me under the bilingual education program, you are clearly eligible for it.

Ms. **Ostrow**. There has been question about that. I believe a proposal has been written about the fact that we have a multicultural setting here, and supposedly that is in the works now.

Senator MONDALE. There is money there, and it seems to me this is almost a classic kind of institution because you have children who come to this institution with languages other than English, do you not?

Ms. PANTON. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. Mostly Spanish?

Ms. PANTON. Because of our location, we do not have too many Spanish speaking, but we do have about five of them enrolled. The population of Spanish-speaking people in this area is very low, but we do have some.

Senator MONDALE. Suppose you had to reduce your budget to a level of, say, about $800 a year per child, which I gather is about what the average day care center spends around here. What would this do?

Ms. OSTROW. I feel very strongly about the fact that even though we are funded at the rate we are, I would say that I personally put in $10, $20, or $30 per week in trying to keep my classroom going. Before I came here, it was even worse, in that we did not have Government funding. I cannot imagine what the teachers did then.

We all share the work. There are assistant teachers who work as teachers. They work 8 hours, and with income as low as $5,500 a year.

Senator MONDALE. Do you have quite a bit of turnover as a result?

Ms. OSTROW. We have been lucky not to have too much.

Ms. PANTON. Right; because of the kind of creative program we have, we have been able to attract and keep people.

Senator MONDALE. You are saying we are going to pay enough to you to survive, and we would like you to be a hero to boot?

Ms. PANTON. Right.

Senator MONDALE. The love for children keeps you going?

Ms. OSTROW. It is unfair. I have thought about it a lot this year. I feel it is unfair.

Senator MONDALE. I do not think an institution can last on heroism for ever. People just wear out.

Ms. PANTON. That is exactly what is happening to Capitol East. Fortunately, we are going on, because there is hope.

Senator MONDALE. All the children here have working parents?

Ms. PATTON. Yes; we have three mothers that are actively seeking employment. All the others are working.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ostrow follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHARI OSTROW, TEACHER, CAPITOL EAST CHILDREN'S CENTER

I have been a teacher at the Capitol East Children's Center for the past three years. Next year I shall be codirector in charge of curriculum as well as continuing my duties as head teacher of the four-year-olds. I came to the center ready for an exciting change from the public school system and I feel that I found it at Capitol East. Before coming here I had taught in a variety of places—one year in Bedford Styvessant in Brooklyn, N.Y. in a federally sponsored program that emphasized parent and community involvement, three years as a kindergarten teacher in an inner-city school in Buffalo, N.Y. and one year as a first grade teacher in Prince Georges County, Maryland. There I was in Follow Through, a federally funded program for economically disadvantaged children. Capitol East Children's Center is the first place I've been where each day I have seen efforts made to create a positive experience for children and staff and parents. Though I am most enthusiastic about our program, I often feel that it requires the dedication, energy, and enthusiasm that is beyond human capabilities. In comparison with the public school system the pay is low (I receive about ⅔ of what I would make as a teacher in the District of Columbia). The hours are long (8 hour shifts as opposed to the 6½ hour day of a public school teacher; and vacations are short (we work a 12 month year as compared to a 9½ month year). Although the above is true, I would not leave Capitol East until I felt I had spent all my energy. The parent involvement, dedication and perceptive abilities of the staff, and, above all, the marvelous excitement of the children make this a challenging, although draining job.

When I decided to leave the public schools, I visited many day care centers. Several were places where children passively watched television as teachers sat and looked on. Other situations had children running chaotically in and out of rooms where little looked stimulating or exciting in terms of expanding children's experiences. Capitol East does not operate in either of the above ways. We believe in Children's involvement with their environment and in offering as many exciting experiences as possible. I have about 18 children in my group. They are divided between black and white with several Spanish speaking children. There are two assistants who work with me. We try to function as equals in the room, not as teacher and aides. We plan together and share classroom responsibilities. In the course of a day we can be involved in a number of activities. These could include art projects, baking and cooking experiences, language experience games, home-made flannel board stories, helping the children plan for shop and prepare a luncheon or breakfast in honor of a letter in the alphabet or a color, creative dramatics, reading readiness skills, science projects, auditory and visual discrimination games and creative movement. In addition we are talking to children and discussing their feelings and thoughts, doing playground supervision, chauffering children in my car, supervising trips, mopping up floors and sponging off tables, cleaning the room, setting up for lunch, rubbing backs before naptime, nursing bruised elbows and hurt knees, and on infinitum.

We try to do as many exciting things as we can. Several weeks ago we took the 4's and 5's on an overnight camping trip. We're currently setting up a darkroom for the children's use. In fact, the staff is often working on new ideas so that the children are happy, motivated, and expanding their experience. Many of these activities require the active participation of the parents especially when involved in multicultural experiences.

The day in a good day care center does not end when an eight hour shift is over. Because we're working with parents who work, the staff must be available in the evenings to talk to parents about specific problems. Evening home visits are made to talk about the curriculum and the child's specific needs. There are evening parent meetings, meeting of the parent boards, and meetings of the four-year-old's parents. My phone has rung as late as midnight and as early as 6:30 a.m. because a parent has been concerned about a specific issue.

Good day care is not babysitting, it is a job that takes a total commitment from staff and parents.

I believe that we, the staff, meet the child at a critical time in his/her life—the first five years. We watch the child struggle with many difficult concepts—his/her first separation from his parents, his/her first school situation, his/her first attempt to make friends and after his/her dealings with difficult home situations such as the separation of parents or the birth of a younger sibling. In order to effectively help our children we must often help our parents, and try to ease their minds about their own situations. We become, in part, psychologists and social workers as well as teachers. This added to the classroom duties described above make our job challenging and exciting but often the kind of job that burns one out and tires one out.

Day care is still in its infancy in this country. I firmly believe that we need to educate parents about the importance of our task and we need much more federal support in order to make our programs work. Without the above two items, day care is destined to fall short of its true potential.

Senator MONDALE. Our next panel consists of parents from Capitol East Children's Center. They are Reginald Mathews, Judith Mudd, Noel Kane, and Gloria Dandridge.

I am going to ask each of you to keep your statements to 2 or 3 minutes, and then we will get into questions.

STATEMENT OF REGINALD MATHEWS, JUDITH MUDD, NOEL FANE, AND GLORIA DANDRIDGE, A PANEL OF PARENTS FROM CAPITOL EAST CHILDREN'S CENTER

Mr. MATHEWS. There is a need for a national program to develop preschool and day care centers. Abundant and efficient care for preschool centers means hope for millions of families across the country that depend on two salaries to provide, or have single parent families, and these families should have a constructive alternative to leaving their children at home, poorly supervised, or not supervised at all.

The Capitol East Children's Center can be viewed as a good model to go on. For my family it has been the end of a long, tortuous journey of experience with bad centers, from mere custodial care to serious corporal abuse. Here is a center that works in the interest of our children, and refreshingly treats them as human beings.

The staff has been highly competent from the administration down. There has been great interest, great stress on building toward the all around physical and mental development of the children.

Economically, the school has offered a positive alternative to the overburdening of family budgets.

The Children's Center has continually strived to provide well-balanced, high quality programs. We have had at least seven centers and two day care centers since our child was a year old. There has been only one which could be considered good, or even satisfactory. The only other exception being, of course, the Capitol East Children's Center, which must be judged very good to excellent, given current American standards.

The only way such centers can continue to improve and proliferate at present is with the concerted effort of the communities across the country to establish programs, and the dedication of the Congress to legislate national policy and appropriate sufficient funds so that the needs of all are met.

We must remember that our children are our future.

Thank you.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much.

Judith Mudd.

Ms. MUDD. My name is Judith Mudd.

Senator MONDALE. Let us put your statement in the record at the conclusion of your testimony, because I want to ask you a few questions.

How many children do you have?

Ms. MUDD. One child.

Senator MONDALE. How old?

Ms. MUDD. She was four yesterday.

Senator MONDALE. You have done college work; have you not?

Ms. MUDD. Yes. I just completed my Master's degree, and I have 18 hours toward the doctorate.

Senator MONDALE. Master's degree in what?

Ms. MUDD. South Asian language and area studies.

Senator MONDALE. Good luck.

You moved here from Louisville?

Ms. Mudd. Yes. I moved here from Louisville. I had gone to college in Baltimore, and I had an encounter with an international experience, also got married during this international experience, and got a divorce during the experience, and came back to Louisville, had my baby, began working when she was 6 weeks old.

When she was a year old, I moved to Washington, after getting a fellowship.

Senator Mondale. When you came here, you had trouble finding decent day care programs, and your testimony recounts one unhappy experience.

Ms. Mudd. Yes.

Senator Mondale. How did you find this day care center—did you have trouble getting in, and so on?

Ms. Mudd. Yes; I stumbled upon this center because a neighbor of mine sent her daughter here, and I am very inquisitive, so I asked. Because the experience I had with the previous center was so bad, I took it upon myself to begin a search for a center, and I came on this place by word of mouth. I came over and I visited here.

I talked with Gloria Panton, and she told me she would put me on the waiting list. Two weeks later she called me. I was so lucky, because they needed a girl in the income group that I was in.

Senator Mondale. Is your child happy here?

Ms. Mudd. She is very happy here. It has been a very positive factor for her and me. I was able to get employment. I no longer fall in that half of the parents who were not paying tuition. Now I pay tuition.

Senator Mondale. What do you pay, if I may ask?

Ms. Mudd. I pay $20 a week.

Senator Mondale. So you are paying nearly half the cost?

Ms. Mudd. That is right. As my salary goes up, I will pay more.

Senator Mondale. The fact that you could find a decent place for your child made it possible for you to take further education, find the job you need, get off welfare, and pay part of the cost of this program?

Ms. Mudd. Yes; in summary, that is correct. But more than that, I think the fact that because I found a place that was good, was quality, and that I did not have to worry about—if I did not get over here by 5:30, that I would not be charged for paying an extra day, or that she might well be put out on the street—my mind was free. So I was psychologically ready to take charge of my own life. Before it was a kind of month to month condition.

Senator Mondale. Thank you very much.

Noel Kane.

Mr. Kane. I would like to request that this corrected copy of my prepared testimony be placed in the record, if I could.

Senator Mondale. It will be placed in the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mr. Kane. I am Noel Kane. I have lived in Washington for 7 years. Our daughter has gone to the center for about 3½ years, and our son has gone for about 1 year. I am an attorney at the Federal Trade Commission. My wife works at Folger Shakespeare Library, located here on Capitol Hill.

As you have heard this morning, the emphasis of this center, and all such centers, is to provide adequate day care of people with low-income groups. I am not a member of the low-income group. My income, and my wife's income would make us a middle, or even an upper income family.

We pay the maximum tuition at the center, which is $45 a week for Justin. The $45 a week falls just short, perhaps $10 short, of the cost of the education that he received, to give you some idea of this figure we are talking about.

There may be a slight variance of figures we heard earlier today, but it is essentially the same. The quality of education provided by the day care center is important to people like myself who have a child, who are paying the upper income amounts, just as it is important to the people who are paying either no tuition, or very little tuition.

The quality that we find here is something that we were not able to find in various other day care facilities and programs in previous years. That is, our son has had a chance, and our daughter before him, to go to this center with children from differing backgrounds and religions, et cetera.

This is something we had not been able to find before. This is something we consider extremely important.

A second factor that makes the center very important to us, is that ironically, having day care for us leads to stability in our family, just as I am sure it does in families of other income groups.

We are both assured that our child is getting medical care here, not being put out, as Ms. Mudd said, at 5:30 if we do not happen to show up at 5:30 or 6, and if we are a little bit late, or even significantly late.

I think this is going to happen more and more in the future. No matter what income class you are talking about, this is going to continue.

Senator MONDALE. We had a witness yesterday, but I did not get to hear him. He said you have got it all wrong, that the most important thing in all cases is that the mothers stay home and take care of those children.

I believe his testimony stated the decision you have made that both parents should work is a very unwise decision for the health of your child, emotional upbringing, separation from you, et cetera.

Do you think he is wrong?

Mr. KANE. I would ask if he is speaking from studies, or actual experience or——

Senator MONDALE. He claimed he had studies.

Mr. KANE. Well, as a lawyer, I am suspicious of studies, because I do not know what basis they have been done on, et cetera.

Even if I assume the correctness of that study, for the overall group, as far as our family is concerned, we have made the right decision. I have no doubt about it.

Senator MONDALE. Do you think that your confidence in that conclusion is possible because of the quality of the day care program?

Mr. KANE. I think it is due to the quality, both of the mix of the children here, the openness and frankness of the personnel and teachers, such as Mrs. Panton and Ms. Ostrow, and the realization that the center is so close to us geographically because we only live a block and a half away. We have been involved with this for so many years, but it is so close, so much a part of us, that we do not think of it as a separate entity.

Senator **Mondale.** Does your child go happily in the morning, or what?

Mr. **Kane.** That is sometimes a battle, and sometimes it is not. But that is not true with our daughter who loved school the moment she started, and has enjoyed the first grade here very much. That varies tremendously.

I do not see any difference between that and any other children. It has engendered in them a strong sense of independence and character that I often see in children of relatives of mine who frankly, in my opinion, do spend too much time at home with ther parents.

Senator **Mondale.** What is your pay at the Federal Trade Commission, if I may ask?

Mr. **Kane.** It would be approximately $22,000.

Senator **Mondale.** Not being personal, what does your wife make at the Library?

Mr. **Kane.** That would be approximately $14,000.

Senator **Mondale.** Thank you very much.

Gloria Dandridge.

Ms. **Dandridge.** My name is Gloria Dandridge. I am a parent of one of the kids that attends the school here.

The Capitol East Children's Center was started because some parents in the Southeast community saw that there were working mothers who needed day care help.

There was a teacher and a concerned parent knocking on doors, asking people if they would be interested in a day care preschool center.

There were no special qualifications for the parents to enroll their children. This center was, and still is, run by parent participation, members of the board, the director, teachers, teacher aides, and interested persons in the community.

It sounds as if I am the founder of Capitol East Children's Center, but I am not. Instead, I am one of the many parents who enrolled my son when the center first started.

To go into my background a bit, I am a single parent, receiving no support from the father of my child.

Capitol East Children's Center has helped in many ways. They have made it possible for me to maintain an 8-hour-a-day job, knowing that my child is properly fed, is well loved by faculty staff, as well as his classmates. He is exposed to interracial groupings, different economical, educational, financial backgrounds, and different religious practices.

To go a little deeper, my child has a hearing impairment, and still has a speech problem. This did not take anything away from him because the director and staff worked very closely with me to see that my child heard all that was going on in class.

They helped in every way they could in his speech problem, even saw to it that he had time to see a speech therapist, and we all worked with her.

There had been a time when the center had to make a decision as to whether my child could attend the center, because I was financially unable to pay the increased tuition fee, but I was later told by the director that the decision had been made, and my child could continue to attend the center at the rate I was paying. This was the best news I could have heard, because I had become worried about a babysitter, knowing very well they—the babysitter—would be more than what I was paying the center. The only alternative was maybe to quit my job, go on welfare, and take care of my son myself.

Like I said before, the center is parent controlled. I have been the tuition bookkeeper, the chairman of the Parent Committee, and started working on the board, but was unable to attend regular board meetings—I had babysitter problems—so I did not participate there long. I have helped make decisions for the parent/teacher activities, so you see, there is no bearing on your status. To be a part of the center is to have the time and interest in what the center is doing.

A day care preschool program such as Capitol East Children's Center with the dedication of all the staff has helped me keep a job while my child takes a part in the society—not as an out part on life, but as a normal, intelligent, heathy, lovable child. And this center was my reason for not being on welfare, as the alternative of my child's interest. Thank you.

Senator MONDALE. Gloria, what do you make a year?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Right now I just received an increase in salary, and I think I make $8,200.

Senator MONDALE. What do you do?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. I am a clerk-typist.

Senator MONDALE. Clerk-typist?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. What do you pay here for your child?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. I think it is $10 a week.

Senator MONDALE. What would you be entitled to if you went on welfare, approximately?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. I do not know.

Senator MONDALE. About what would you get for you and your child if you went on welfare?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. I have no idea.

Ms. MUDD. When I was on welfare, I got $161 a month, I think.

Senator MONDALE. You pay taxes, do you not?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. Why do you not just go on welfare?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. As long as I have a center like Capitol East Center to help me with day care and training, he goes to school, he enjoys it, he is well loved by all concerned, I do feel that I have peace of mind, and I am able to work.

Senator MONDALE. You prefer to work?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Yes; I do.

Senator MONDALE. You say your child has a hearing and speech impairment.

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Yes; he does.

Senator MONDALE. Is he getting help with that?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. Can you tell the difference?

Ms. DANDRIDGE. Of course. The first time the center noticed his hearing problem, it was brought to my attention, and I put this matter to my doctor. They checked into it, and naturally, they did find that he did have a hearing impairment.

The first time my son actually heard without any strain, it was beautiful to see the expression on his face. I felt real good about it.

Senator **MONDALE**. He is coming along fine, then?

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. Very well, yes.

Senator **MONDALE**. Did you know he had a hearing defect when you brought him here?

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. I thought perhaps he may have, but when I took him to the doctor, they could not find anything. But as he grew a little older, it was more recognizeable.

Senator **MONDALE**. Are you divorced?

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. Never been married.

Senator **MONDALE**. I see. The father will not contribute?

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. No, he will not.

Senator **MONDALE**. Has he been asked?

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. Yes.

Senator **MONDALE**. What does he say?

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. No.

Senator **MONDALE**. I really believe that fathers should contribute something, if they can.

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. That is what I felt, too.

Senator **MONDALE**. We are trying to develop public support on this program. You could go on welfare. Maybe if you got your pencil out, you would just about do as well. But you decided to work. You are paying taxes. You are giving your child a chance.

Ms. Mudd, you are doing the same. You have gotten advanced training, and you are now taking care of yourself, and paying taxes.

People do not hear about this. They just hear about people who do not care. One of the things that gripes the public is the feeling that there might be a father around who could chip in, who does not. I do not know whether he could afford to pay something or not.

Ms. **DANDRIDGE**. Well, aboult 4 years ago I heard he was making $10,000 a year. I am sure he is making more now. If he could not do anything else, he could at least pay the tuition fees for my son to attend the center.

Ms. **RAWLINGS**. On the paper that was handed out at the hearing, they had me as a "Mrs." I am not a Mrs. I am a Miss. I am a single, head of household, with two children.

You say why do you not try to get some help for your children from the father. OK, the time you spend going through the court procedures, and if you have a job, losing days from work, going down there, and trying to find—well, you know, it is a big hassle for the little bit of payment they give you. It is not worth it. It is better to have peace of mind, knowing if you can do it yourself, go ahead and do it yourself.

Maybe you cannot get the luxury items in life, but if it is enough to get by, and you do not have to answer to anyone, no one has strings on how much money you are making, it is worth it. That is why I wanted to correct the paper.

I am not a "Mrs." I am a "Miss" by myself.

Senator **MONDALE**. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statements of Ms. Mudd and Mr. Kane follow:]

STATEMENT OF MS. JUDITH MUDD, PARENT, CAPITOL EAST CHILDREN'S CENTER

The experience which I have had with child care cannot be separated from the realities which a single parent confronts if she chooses a life outside the home. My situation was complicated by the fact that I am a member of a minority group and at the time was of low income status. While unique in detail, I am sure that my story is similar to that of other mothers who like me have had to deal with the factor of adequate child care while they were trying to make a better life for themselves and their children.

When I came to Washington from Louisville over two years ago, I did not foresee the difficulties I would have in finding an adequate environment in which to place my child while I was in school. I had come to the District to study toward a Masters Degree and to eventually find employment. With rent and food absorbing nearly all the monthly stipend of $300 which my fellowship gave me, and after paying for transportation, there was little left to pay a babysitter. Since Rekha was then only 13 months old, there was no day care center in D.C. which would accept her. With sufficient income I would be able to hire a sitter on a permanent basis, quickly finish my course work and locate employment. It is difficult now to really explain the dilema I was in during those days of seeming hopelessness. I became nervous and overwrought to the point that I began to act against myself, developed a chronic exema on my hands and gained an enormous amount of weight.

While I did not regress academically, I also did not have the same degree of enthusiasm and self-motivation about completing my education. Afterall, what difference would it make? How could I be positive about the future when I was not certain that it was worth going on any longer? I became withdrawn and almost lost touch with reality. Rekha was my life line . . . but she was also my "problem". I do not mean to assert that she was the source of all my troubles, (I believe that each person is responsible for his own life), but I do mean to say that if I had not had to wrestle with the issue of child care, if I had been able to afford the services of a permanent sitter, I do not think that I would have loitered on the periphery of life for such a long time.

When I applied for public assistance, I was told that I was not eligible because my fellowship stipend was considered a "resource" and not income. On the other hand, I was advised that if I had reported no money at all, I would be able to receive aid. I can still recall the astonishment and puzzlement which I felt when the social worker asked me, "Well, what's more important—a Masters Degree or your child?" I had only sought assistance on an emergency and temporary basis. Surely the people at Human Resources could not think that anyone would spend the time and effort in graduate study if she did not intend to get a job. It would have been so much easier to remain at home and remain a "welfare" mother of a "dependent" child.

I did temporarily suspend my studies to become eligible for public assistance and shortly afterwards went back to school. I was able to enroll Rekha at a nearby center when she was almost two-and-a-half. I paid $20 per week for substandard child care. This center was more of a babysitting factory than a desirable environment for young children. There was no painting, coloring or free play, and the youngest children, which included Rekha, were not allowed to romp outdoors because, as I was told, "There's no one to supervise them." Sixty children were crowded into the space of a small, poorly ventilated basement with no light from the sun. Because the youngest and smallest were at the mercy of the rougher behavior of the older and stronger children, the youngest ones had to be shielded from them at all times. In fact, Rekha often came home with cuts and scratches received from the bigger children.

But what really bothered me about this place was that the teachers had no degrees in early childhood education nor any area of education. They were essentially "women from the surrounding neighborhood" who happened to have landed the job of looking after young children. Although the director must have been "qualified" in some formal sense, her sedentary, lethargic nature was also characteristic of her staff—all "nice" settled, uncreative women who believed that children should "sit down and be quiet" by 2:30 in the afternoon and watch Channel 20 until pick-up time. The children were shouted at and spanked and my daughter's neat and clean appearance at the end of the day told me that she had not been enjoying herself.

Needless to say, Rekha was very unhappy there and I was unhappy about having to send her there. I did try to have some impact by volunteering to serve on a parent's advisory board, but this was of no avail because no one really wanted to change. Eventually, I just stopped sending her there and would take her to class with me. I could not really make plans about my life because I was constantly worried about adequate child care.

When I learned of and visited the Children's Center, I knew that it would be the answer to my needs. The atmosphere was cheerful and creative. The children were all busy doing things: painting, playing with playdough, feeding the rabbit, roaming around in grown-up clothes and just generally having fun. There was an eagerness and sparkle in their eyes which I had not seen in any of the centers which I had visited and also a casual, free relationship with the teachers and assistants. Mrs. Panton's professionalism particularly impressed me as also did her overriding concern about the individual needs of my child and her insistence that as a new parent I would be expected to participate meaningfully in the center.

In summary, what has been most beneficial to me has been the advantage of the bus which pick-ups and returns, the fact that the center offers a wholesome breakfast, lunch and nutrious snacks, the care and concern of the staff and the dynamic nature of the educational program in general. Above all, Rekha feels loved and is learning how to relate and live with children of various races, cultural and ecnomic groups. It is especially important that the day care center atmosphere be a stabilizing influence in my child's life and as much as possible like a home environment. Children's Center fulfills this need in my case. Since Rekha has no sisters, brothers or father, I appreciate the fact that the center is teaching her to work and play well with others; she is learning to be a part of a group and still receive individual attention. She is learning to accept her multicultured heritage and to respect the traditions and customs of others.

Children's Center has been my key to self-support, my escape out of the "welfare trap" and the ticket to a more enriching life for myself and my child. It has been the decisive factor in helping me to build a more productive future. I am profoundly thankful for its existence and hope that it can continue to function.

STATEMENT OF MR. NOEL KANE, PARENT, CAPITOL EAST CHILDREN'S CENTER

Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to be with you this morning. My name is Noel Kane and I live about a block from here at 118 5th Street, NE. I'm an attorney with the Federal Trade Commission, my wife works at the Folger Shakespeare Library. We've lived in Washington for seven years. Our daughter, Jessica, went to the Capitol East Children's Center for three and a half years and was in the first grade last year in this building. Justin, our son, was in the Center's three-year-old class this past year. I'd like this morning to give you some of my thoughts about the utility of such facilities like the Children's Center.

In order for both my wife and myself to work, we have had to make arrangements for our children during the day. When we began looking for possible day care programs, we quickly realized that institutions providing something more than custodial care were in short supply. We also found that many of the facilities in the area with preschool care had children in it who were almost always from backgrounds similar to that of our children—white and middle class. In addition, nursery schools which offered high-quality education were not geared to the needs of working parents.

That is why we are fortunate to be able to send our children to the Children's Center, which has developed a curriculum for three, four, and five-year-olds, has drawn children from all classes and backgrounds, and has hours which are designed to fit the needs of working families. It is hard to over-estimate the satisfaction it gave us to know that Justin was learning and growing last year while we were working. It was exciting to have him come home each day with a new idea or concept or with a story of some adventure he had enjoyed that day with a favorite friend. We realize how lucky we have been to have Justin go to the Center—the waiting list is lengthy.

There's no doubt in my mind that adequate day care for the children of working parents is going to become more and more a critical issue as more and more couples decide that both are going to work. This is going to happen either because both the husband and wife want to work or because inflation has forced them to. However, the costs of running and staffing such facilities are substantial. The costs are increasing. Yet parents are not going to want to settle for custodial care for their children. Parents are also discovering that most nursery schools have fine morning programs but have no after-school session to care for children until the end of the work day.

There is going to be more and more pressure on governments to fund an adequate number of high quality day care facilities. Every time the funding of day care is mentioned many people seem to take leave of their senses and begin to mutter in cantation about the sacredness of the family and the evil effect of government intrusion into this area. Yet adequate day care is not a new or particularly revolutionary idea. When during World War II the domestic labor force was increasingly filled by women, day care for their children was a need which was met without any dire predictions because the survival of the nation was at stake. Day care was then seen as a necessary investment in the future of the country. Today day care is an equally wise investment for government to make. Helping families join the work force will pay off in tax revenues which will add up to more than the money put into the facility by the government. This is true whether you're talking about individuals receiving public assistance or people who just want to get out of the house and go to work.

Any government investment in day care will also be paid back in more intangible benefits. Speaking for myself, I consider it very beneficial to have my children learn to play and learn with children from other backgrounds before they start public school. The start in learning and getting along with others that children can enjoy at the Center should help them begin their public schooling with confidence and enthusiasm.

We live in a time when corporations and other interests are looking for the government to bail them out of financial tangles and to help them with subsidies and tax breaks. The amount of money that the government is being asked to put into day care is comparatively small. In terms of monetary benefits and more intangible returns, money invested in day care will be returned many times over.

Senator **Mondale**. Our next panel is a panel of staff and parents from Wee Care, Inc.: Nancy Goodell, director; Karen Fleischer, past president of Wee Care; and Susan Horack, parent.

STATEMENT OF KAREN FLEISCHER, PAST PRESIDENT OF WEE CARE; ACCOMPANIED BY NANCY GOODELL, DIRECTOR, WEE CARE, INC.; AND SUSAN HORACK, DAY CARE TEACHER

Mrs. **Fleischer**. My name is Karen Fleischer.

We are going to make an abbreviated presentation.

Senator **Mondale**. We will put your statements in the record at the conclusion of your testimony. You have heard what we have heard. Please emphasize the things you think need to go in the record that are not there now.

Mrs. **Fleischer**. What I would like to do, first of all, is ask if I might submit a complete description of our program.

Senator **Mondale**. That will go in the record.

Mrs. **Fleischer**. I would like to present a summary, and then Nancy will talk about our program, how it differs a little bit from Capitol East.

Susan is incorrectly identified as a parent—she is not a parent of a child in Wee Care. She is one of our teachers. We call them day care parents. We used to call our teachers day care mothers, but we just recently hired a young man, so we are calling them day care parents. Susan will have a few words to say.

Just to briefly summarize, Wee Care, a private, nonprofit, family day care organization, currently provides part- and full-time child care services to children, ages 1 to 3, in the Capitol Hill area.

Formed in 1972, Wee Care operates four family day care homes staffed by trained day-care parents. Three homes operate 5 days per week, 9 hours a day; and one operates 3 days per week, 9 hours per day, in the near Northeast and Southeast portions of the Hill area.

An educational director, holding a degree in early childhood education, offers continuous assistance to the day care mothers and coordinates the educational program.

The Wee Care program is administered by a volunteer, unpaid president and board of directors, composed largely of parents of children in the program.

Wee Care is completely self-supporting out of tuitions, which are ranged on a sliding fee scale dependent on family income. Charges for tuition currently range from 35 cents to $1.45 per hour.

Mrs. GOODELL. I have submitted my statement in written form. I want to pick out a few points.

Wee Care came about as a group of parents getting together, figuring out what kind of care they needed for their children between the ages of 1 to 3.

Some of the parents were full-time working people, some were single parents, and some were part-time working mothers.

The difference between our program and the children's center is that it is operated in individual day-care homes, not in a center. There are five children in each group with one day care parent.

Daycare parents try to extend the kind of care parents give at home.

The setting is homelike. Each child has a close relationship with the day-care mother which is so important for children this age as their self-concepts and language skills are developing.

The day-care mother provides the children with affectionate, protective care, the companionship of children, educational experiences, and an environment that can nurture development. Opportunities for outdoor play are provided so that the children can run, jump, climb, dig, play in water, and enjoy seasonal changes. In other words, the day-care mother cares for the children as though they were her own.

In some of the homes, there are 1-year-olds; and in some of the homes, there are 3-year-olds; and in some of the homes, there is a whole range of 1- to 3-year-olds.

We provide both part-time and full-time care. If a family wants to use the program 2 days a week, they do. If they want to use it a full 5 days a week, they do.

Another important part of our program is the pre- and in-service, parent effectiveness training program that goes on with the day care parents and the parents of the children.

As the educational director, I visit the homes weekly and talk to the day care mothers and visit with the children, so the training program is based on the individual needs of the day care mothers and the individual needs of the children themselves.

I have regular workshops with the day care mothers. Topics include: Nutrition for the young child, safety and health procedures, developmental characteristics of children this age and how to plan for them, and experiences for multi-cultural groups of young children.

The parents meet with the day care mothers every 6 weeks so parents have a chance to talk about what the children are doing at home, what the children are doing in their day care homes and together they plan activities, so that the parents are involved from the start to the finish with the programs that go on in the homes.

We feel strongly that Wee Care should not take the place of what goes on at home. It supplements and extends the care that the parents give.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you.

Miss HORAK. Wee Care is a rather unique day care organization. I know we share the same problems that other day care centers have concerning funding. But I feel a strong commitment to this particular organization, the feeling that parents and children have the right to choose from a variety of programs within their own community to meet individual needs of children.

I have really eliminated three-quarters of my testimony which I am submitting in writing.

I would like to talk about the position of teachers. The position of teachers in Wee Care is something I can speak of with a sense of crisis.

Our hours are long and demanding, something which we accept, of course, but for which we feel that we deserve adequate payment.

For a long time, the Wee Care teachers worked 9 hours per day for which they did not receive overtime. Only recently, the board established overtime pay. Some of us are concerned about back overtime pay, which we are legally entitled to.

Proposed benefits and fund raising events show the board's concern and desire to provide what we deserve. Our reluctance to discuss this matter, much less ask for the money, reflects that we understand that Wee Care could fold if put under this particular financial strain.

Our salary is of major concern to ourselves, to parents, and to the board. We are paid $2.25 per hour.

I am finding it nearly impossible to pay off my college loans, much less pursue gradute school which is a personal priority. We receive a 2-week paid vacation per year and 12 sick days per year which are our only benefits.

Without medical or other benefits, it is extremely difficult to meet these expenses totally independently.

As a certified teacher, I could be making a much higher salary as I am reminded by my parents and other people.

I do not particularly care about money. I just want to be able to meet my living expenses and save a little.

I feel a strong commitment to Wee Care and to the overall concept of day care. I find myself willing to give some time and struggle with real financial strain in order to try to help these causes.

For one thing, bills, such as the one that you have proposed, make me hopeful that my attitude is not too naive or too idealistic I think that Federal funding is essential. It is not an unrealistic demand, but an entirely justified priority.

All of the problems Wee Care teachers try to surmount seem to involve finances.

I have a full-time home for children between the ages of 1 to 3. These children are, of course, very young and require constant close attention.

I do not have an aide, and Wee Care cannot afford to hire one. One aide who worked for Wee Care made a total of 10 cents per week after taking out money for transportation and immediate expenses. This may seem ludicrous. This young woman did gain excellent work experience and exposure. However, her financial responsibilities, few as they may seem to others, are very real to herself.

There are crucial problems other than salary dilemmas. They are of great concern to us.

I certainly do not mean to ramble through a list of complaints or demands. I am only presenting a very general and incomplete sketch of our situation.

We desperately require Federal funding in order to operate. We are making a strong effort, but find ourselves increasingly closed in, left with few alternatives to explore.

We are open to change, but are running out of helpful and constructive means to do so.

Wee Care is simply an organization that needs major outside attention and aid. We provide an excellent and vital service to our society, I feel that we deserve some sacrifice and commitment from our Government, which is to serve all of us.

Mrs. FLEISCHER. I have some further comments about cost and administration.

The principal administrator of Wee Care is the board president. I am the parent of a 2½-year-old child in Wee Care. It does not sound like it is much of a deal to have a parent who is an administrator until you think about the demands that are made upon the parents who use day care.

Nearly all the parents of the children in the program work, either part- or full-time. So our responsibilities, as far as administration, are wedged in between our responsibilities to our families, to our jobs, and to the community—we are involved with the community also.

The administration of Wee Care is made more difficult because of the fact that we do operate small centers. There is a maximum of five children in each location; we have five separate locations.

One of the administrative problems we have found insurmountable is licensing. Witnesses earlier this morning talked about the Department of Human Resources and the problems that they are having on a different level.

We have had an individual problem as far as licensing is concerning. We are not licensed by the District of Columbia government. The main reason for that is they have been trying for 2 years to determine which category of licensing standards we should abide by. We do not fall into their bureaucratic guidelines at this point, so we are not licensed—though we are working on it. This is something which we would like to respectfully suggest that your committee investigate—a way of making licensing requirements fit more closely the needs of the people who need and provide day care.

In terms of cost, Wee Care is an expensive program. We know that. The cost to us is about $1 per hour per child, if we have full enrollment.

If we do not have full enrollment, at 60 percent enrollment, for example, it costs us about $1.40 per hour per child.

Translated into a yearly basis, it is about $2,400 a year, which is similar to the costs you have been hearing about today.

Our two greatest expenses are for salaries and rent. We do not receive rent-free locations. We rent space in homes from people who are working outside of their homes. One of our day-care homes is in a church rectory basement. We have not been able to find locations that are rent free.

I have included in the appendix of my statement our tuition scale and costs that are involved, and those you can study later.

As far as the number of children enrolled in each level, we are not succeeding in meeting either our goals as we envisioned them in 1971 or 1972, or the needs of the community, although we are really striving to try to achieve them.

We have a scholarship program underway now where we are going around and asking community businesses if they can contribute to support a child in Wee Care. Much of what we do is directed at increasing our funding level.

Certainly our highest priority is to increase the pay of our staff.

We would be very happy to answer any questions.

Senator **MONDALE**. When was this Wee Care Center established?

Mrs. **FLEISCHER**. It is not one center. It is four homelike centers.

Senator **MONDALE**. This organization and centers were established in 1971?

Mrs. **GOODELL**. We began operating in October 1972.

Senator **MONDALE**. It started as a result of parents who had young preschool children, 1 to 3, who felt the need for such services and none existed.

What is that need?

Are most of the parents in a position where they must work, or is it a matter of personal desire?

What is the breakdown?

What is the typical parent?

Mrs. **FLEISCHER**. It really runs the gamut.

There are only 21 or 22 families involved. It is a kind of small sampling.

We do have women who must work for the support of their families. Particularly when we started, many of our people were in schools. Both parents were studying for further education, and this was one of the reasons they needed care.

Senator **MONDALE**. A lot of parents are students?

Mrs. **FLEISCHER**. In our particular situation, yes.

Capitol Hill is a transient community. A lot of people work for the Government, and a lot of the people are here in Washington because of educational opportunities.

Senator **MONDALE**. They all have to pay the hourly rate prescribed, or are there some subsidized?

Mrs. **GOODELL**. There is a sliding fee scale.

Senator **MONDALE**. Are some getting it free?

Mrs. **GOODELL**. There are no people getting free service.

Senator **MONDALE**. Just could not swing it?

Mrs. **GOODELL**. No; we could not swing it.

Senator **MONDALE**. No public funds in the program?

Mrs. **FLEISCHER**. Not for lack of trying.

Senator **MONDALE**. You have tried the city government. They say no?

Mrs. **FLEISCHER**. We have a proposal now pending before the city government.

Mrs. **GOODELL**. Department of Human Resources.

Mrs. **FLEISCHER**. The latest information we have on that is that it is not going to go anywhere.

Senator **MONDALE**. Are there any other centers around that deal with children this young in the District?

Mrs. **Goodell.** Catholic Charities, I believe, has one, and there is a Rosemont Center in Northwest Washington.

We are the only one on Capitol Hill that I know of.

Senator **Mondale.** You are aware of the fact, I assume, that the opponents of day care centers allege harm will be done to children during these early, especially tender years. They argue that it should not happen, but if it does, it should be a very stable structure, a very high staff ratio to children, and even then they say it is dangerous.

Mrs. **Goodell.** We are very aware of that. We are also very aware that there are some people who just have to have day care.

There are some people in the group who are using the program only part time, but there are some who just have to have full-time care.

We have been very careful to keep the group small. There are no more than five children in each group.

The parents and the day care parents work very closely together so that when a child is going through toilet training, or whatever, the day care parent knows.

We deal very carefully with separation anxiety. The parent spends a lot of time in the day care home when the child first comes, so the child becomes acquainted gradually to the situation.

The setting in each day-care home is homelike, so it is an atmosphere that is familiar to the children. The day-care mother spends much time holding, cuddling, talking to the children as the parents do at home. The day-care mother becomes a part of the child's extended family, because she is there consistently and because she works so closely with the parents.

We are aware of the problem you speak of, and we spend a lot of time in the workshops and a lot of time in our meetings with parents and day-care parents trying to struggle with it.

Mrs. **Fleischer.** I can speak personally to that.

My own son was started in Wee Care 1½ years ago.

Senator **Mondale.** What were you doing?

Mrs. **Fleischer.** I was in school. I was concluding my degree in guidance counseling.

I arranged my classwork so I could complete it in two days a week. I started him going 2 days a week to Wee Care. I was very concerned about leaving him. He is my first child, and he was only 1 year old.

I really felt in very close contact with Nancy and his day-care mother at that time. The day-care mother had children of her own and was very much aware of the needs of a 1-year-old.

I really felt that the stability of the program and the small size of the program was suitable for my needs and my son's. I do not think my son has suffered any.

I would be happy to bring him here for any opponents to judge for themselves.

Senator **Mondale.** I see two hands up in the audience.

Mr. **Williams.** Just on that point, Senator, most of the day-care centers which are licensed, like Rosemont and Capitol East, Catholic Charities, and two or three others, have been working very closely together over the last 2 or 3 years.

Our emphasis has been to bring the cost of care down as much as possible, but not to lose sight of the fact that if we do not keep staff ratios low also, which means more staff per child, we are really going to run into problems that you mentioned the opponents of day care see.

Mrs. Kane. I understand there was a critic who said that people who could afford it should not leave their children in day care.

Senator Mondale. The critic said in no instance should she leave.

Mrs. Kane. However, there are mothers who cannot afford to stay home with their children, and therefore, these people need an acceptable substitute.

Our children have been in care outside of the home—well, one since she was 4 months old, and the other since he was 6 weeks old.

In the beginning, this was not my choice. I was the only provider. My husband was in school.

The second child being placed in day care was not by necessity but by choice.

From the point of view of the good of the child, I found the child is much better off knowing that there is someone else besides me taking care of him. Knowing there are other people out there that care about them, they have a much greater sense of security.

Even if I had $1 million, I would not stay home with my children all of the time.

It is educationally and intellectually advantageous to them to have contact with other kinds of people, and other people who can care for them.

From the point of view of the mother, I feel just like the people on welfare did, that it is just as demeaning to stay home and have the husband support you as it is to have the welfare department support you.

Senator Mondale. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statements of Mrs. Fleischer, Mrs. Goodell, and Miss Horak, and other pertinent material submitted for the record follow:]

WEE CARE—A District of Columbia Non-Profit Corporation

Mr. Chairman. My name is Karen Fleischer and I am the immediate past President of WEE CARE. The present President is acting only in a temporary capacity, and has asked me to present the testimony regarding the staffing and administration of WEE CARE.

Our Educational Director, Nancy Goodell, has described to you some of the history, philosophy and goals of WEE CARE. We have brought with us a more detailed description of the educational program and the in-service training which Nancy conducts; I would like to ask permission to submit this description for the record of this hearing.

Not only is parent involvement a key to the planning of the children's activities and the educational program, but it also is the key to the administration and coordination of the individual family day care centers.

WEE CARE is incorporated in the District of Columbia as a non-profit organization, and is administered by a Board of Directors composed of 11 members, no fewer than 6 of which are required by our by-laws to be parents of children in WEE CARE.

The Board is an integrated, working unit, composed of both men and women, and is responsible for policy decisions. The officers of the Corporation are elected from the membership of the Board. All Board members and officers contribute their time on a volunteer basis.

The President of the Board of Directors is the principal administrator of WEE CARE. The President is not paid, but is supported by the efforts of other Board members, parents and a part-time Administrative Assistant, who is salaried for 8 hours per week.

A parent acting as principal administrator does not sound like much of a job until you think for a moment about the time limitations on most parents who use day care. Nearly all the parents of children in the program work, either full or part time. The program's administration must be wedged in between responsibilities to child, spouse, job, home and usually, community.

In addtion, the physical decentralization essential to maintaining the "family" part of our day care, intensifies difficulties of administration and communication.

One of the administrative problems we have met is licensing. Our organization is not, at this time, licensed by the D.C. Government. We have been conscious of our responsibility in this area, and have endeavored for 2 years—working with the licensing inspector—to ascertain and conform to the requirements. We have encountered bureaucratic difficulties because we do not, by our organization's size and set up, fit into a licensing category as they are presently defined by the District Government.

We would like to respectfully suggest that local licensing requirements be studied by your committees with the objective of encompassing within them the widest possible range of child and family care services.

In terms of both cost to the parents (tuition) and cost to the organization, WEE CARE is an expensive program. In the fall of 1972, when we began, we "guestimated" our costs would run about $1.00 per hour per child. That figure worked out about right. It costs us about $1.10 per hour per child when the homes are 80% full. At 60% capacity, the cost to us is $1.40 per hour per child. Translated into monthly costs, we run about $200.00 per full time child; on a yearly basis, it is slightly over $2,400 per full time child.

The two greatest expenses of the program are the salaries of the day care parents and the costs involved in renting space on Capital Hill for our centers to be located.

The day care parents receive a gross salary of $106.90 per week, for a 45 hour week—a salary which we are the first to admit is embarrassingly inadequate.

Our program is entirely self-supporting and attempts to maintain an enrollment that represents a wide range of economic conditions by having a tuition policy based on what a family can afford to pay. This has been translated into a sliding tuition scale based on family income. We have included as Appendix A the tuition scale and number of children enrolled at each level.

We have no limitations on the number of children that will be accepted at each income level. In order to meet expenses, however, the program requires an overall average of $1.00 per hour per child with full enrollment. The admissions policy is geared to producing such an average.

I would like to make one comment on our enrollment at the present time. August is our lowest capacity month because of vacation. Last March and April we were running about 80% capacity.

As you can see from the numbers enrolled at each level, we are not really succeeding in meeting either our goals for ourselves or the needs of the community. We are dedicated to our goals and we are constantly searching for a way to maintain a quality program without sacrificing our economic integration.

For example, we have a committee right now canvassing the community for long term donations to provide scholarships for low income families to participate in the program. We hope this will give us additional income to raise our teachers' salaries, as well as expand our commitment to the community.

We have attached as Appendix B, a rough summary of our costs and our income for a typical month. As you can see, June produced a deficit of $125.74, a characterisic of summer months.

Even with full enrollment, we are faced with an inability to give our teachers the salaries and benefits we feel they deserve. The alternatives—such as raising tuitions, doing away with the sliding scale—are not wholly consistent with the ideals and goals we have set for our program.

Some of us are concerned about the extent to which private citizens of middle and upper middle income levels are supporting the poverty level children. We ask ourselves whether day care for all who need it is a public or a private responsibility.

We see the high percentage of our income we pay for day care and we are well aware of the expense of a quality program, but we can not help but believe that quality care for children should be a prerogative for all income levels of the population.

With public funding we could include lower income children without increasing an already heavy burden on the parents, particularly those in levels 3 and 4. We feel that those paying the highest percentage of their income could be getting more for their money if they were not helping to support the lower income groups who must themselves find the means to cope with the high cost of care—particularly the costs for families with more than one child needing care

We feel that WEE CARE qualifies as a recipient of project funds under the requirements and standards you have set in your bills. We sincerely hope that we can keep WEE CARE alive long enough to compete for those funds when these bills are enacted.

APPENDIX A

Income level	Tuition per day	Children enrolled	Child-days per week	Percent of full-time tuition of income
1. Over $25,000	$13.05	4	16	[1] 13.5
2. $20,000 to $24,999	11.70	2	4	[1] 15.2
3. $16,000 to $19,999	10.35	4	13½	[1] 16.8
4. $9,000 to $15,999	9.00	2	5	[1] 26.0
5. $6,500 to $8,999	4.50	3	9	[1] 18.0
6. Below $6,000	3.15	1	5	[2] 12.6
Total		16	52½	

[1] Or less.

[2] Or more.

Note: Total possible child-days, (90). Percent of capacity (58 percent). Percentage spent on day care at each level varies from 12.6 percent to 26.0 percent. The average percentage at level 4 is 19 percent.

APPENDIX B(1)

WEE CARE—MONTHLY COSTS

Salaries: 3 day care parents full time; 1 day care parent 3-days per week (including FICA and DC withholding tax); 1 educational director 12 hours per week; 1 administrative assistant—8 hours per week	$2,105.64
Rent:	
3–5 day centers	255.00
1–3 day centers	55.00
Total	310.00
Food: Food estimate for all centers	145.00
Aides and substitutes: Estimate	155.00
Equipment and miscellaneous: Estimate	120.00
Total	2,835.64
Total income (June 1974)	2,709.90
Deficit	125.74

APPENDIX B(2)

ALLOCATION OF COSTS

	Percent		Percent
Administration	4	Food	5
Personnel	76	Rent	11
Equipment	4		

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Wee Care, a private, non-profit, family day-care organization, currently provides part and full-time child care services to children ages 1–3 in the Capitol Hill area.

Formed in 1972, Wee Care operates 4 family day care homes staffed by trained day care parents. Three homes operate 5 days a week (9 hours a day) and one operates 3 days per week (9 hours a day) in the near northeast and Southeast portions of the Hill area. An educational director, holding a degree in early childhood education, offers continuous assistance to the day care mothers and coordinates the educational program.

The Wee Care program is administered by a volunteer, unpaid President and Board of Directors composed largely of parents of children in the program.

Wee Care is completely self-supporting out of tuitions, which are ranged on a sliding fee scale dependent on family income. Charges for tuition currently range from $.35 to $1.45 per hour.

WEE CARE'S PROGRAM

Wee Care has a program designed to meet the developmental needs of children between the ages of one and three. The atmosphere is very relaxed. The setting is homelike. The children play, eat, rest and participate in educational activities, much as if they were in their own homes.

The children are grouped in the home based on proximity of age and maintenance of a racial mixture. Wee Care presently has four day care "mothers" who care for no more than five children at one time.

An important aspect of a child's development between the ages of one and three is the need for a strong relationship with an adult on an individual basis. This kind of relationship is possible at Wee Care because the day care "mothers" deal with only five children at one time. The day care "mothers" spend time holding, talking, and playing with each child. Some of the children are beginning to walk. Some are beginning to talk. Some are relating to other children for the first time, and some are relating to adults other than their parents for the first time. The day care "mothers" are aware of these developmental landmarks. They relate to the children according to their individual needs and they plan their daily and weekly activities keeping those needs in mind.

The general developmental areas included in the program are: physical, emotional and cognitive. More developments are encouraged through physical games that are played. The children stretch, dance and in other ways exercise the large muscles. There is a variety of toys in each home to further the development of both large and small muscles, included are riding, crawling, and climbing toys for large muscles and manipulative toys and puzzles for small muscles.

The Wee Care home provides a healthy atmosphere for emotional development. The day care "mothers" help the children work out their feeling of separation anxiety. They work with the parents to help the children through stressful time, such as the birth of a brother or sister, a move, or a family separation. The child's movement towards independency is encouraged and their needs for dependency are recognized.

Wee Care is a medium for social interchange. The children learn how to deal with individuals their own age and size and do so under the supervision of the day care "mother." Foundations are also laid during this time span for sharing and for the channeling of aggression.

The fourth area of development that Wee Care concerns itself with is the cognitive area. The child is learning his language skills at this period, and Wee Care day care "mothers" are trained by our Educational Director to pick up language skills and work with the child developing them. The day care "mothers" talk with the children and repeat their phrases. Use is also made of the educational television program, Sesame Street. The children watch the show occasionally as it fits in with the day care mothers' program.

A certain portion of each day is also spent in reading to the children so that they may become familiar with books and words and use this familiarity as a basis for further learning when they are ready. Each day care "mother" provides a balanced mix of activities, such as water play, making and using play dough, coloring and painting, and taking walks around the neighborhood. Through these activities, the children learn many things in a very spontaneous manner.

STAFF TRAINING AND HIRING

The day care "mothers" must meet all the qualifications and regulations necessary for licensing as day care mothers by the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources. In addition, day care mothers must satisfy Wee Care that they: (a) have experience with young children and have recommendations from previous employers; (b) exhibit a sincere interest in young children; (c) exhibit a willingness to work with the parents and the board members and meet with them regularly; (d) exhibit a willingness to be a part of the Wee Care organization, support its philosophy and carry out its policies; (e) exhibit a personality amenable to children; (f) are in good health and are so certified by a doctor; (g) have sufficient verbal skills to express their thoughts clearly and communicate with the children and the adults with whom they must work; (h) exhibit a willingness to work with professionals and participate in the on-going training program; and (i) exhibit a willingness to work closely with the Educational Director and learn from her expertise.

The day care "mothers" have varying degrees of experience in educating preschool children and are being continually trained by the Educational Director, Nancy Goodell. Mrs. Goodell conducted an initial training session with the day care "mothers" in October, 1972, in which there were lectures, discussions, and practice sessions involving many of the educational techniques which Wee Care has instituted in its centers. Included for consideration were developmental characteristics of 1–3 year olds, and the kinds of supportive attitudes and play activities beneficial to the successful social and emotional adjustment of children undergoing the kinds of changes of this age group. In addition, ongoing training sessions are conducted approximately every 6 weeks.

The day care "mothers" receive training in a variety of subjects including the following areas: The first area of training is the area of play—the different kinds of activities that are appropriate for this age group. The day care "mothers" learn what to expect of the children and what activities are good for the development of the children. They are also trained in the proper use of toys, including which toys are appropriate for which ages. A nurse was employed during the initial session to teach the day care "mothers" what to do in case of emergencies, and what symptoms to be aware of in case of illness or disease. The nurse also discussed nutrition with the day care mothers, and sample menus were worked out by the day care mothers with guidance from the nurse and Educational Director. In addition to the above areas of training, discussion also centered on attitudes of the day care "mothers" about children and the various emotional problems that children of this age group experience. For example, separation anxiety was discussed and the day care "mothers" learned how to cope with a child's fears at being separated from his mother.

To continue the training, the Educational Director visits each of the centers once a week giving suggestions to the individual day care mothers as to the kinds of activities appropriate to each group of children based on the particular developmental stage involved. The day care "mothers" also meet periodically with a consulting psychologist concerning general emotional development and specific emotional problems that arise. In addition, regular followup workshops for re-training and continuing education of the day care mothers are held.

A further educational aspect of our program is the regular parent-day care "mother" meetings. The purpose of these meetings is to help the day care "mothers" know the children she is dealing with by knowing and talking to the parents. These meetings also provide a forum for the parents, and a place to find out how their child reacts to an educational situation.

CURRENT FUNDING

The program is entirely self-supporting and is able to maintain an enrollment that represents a wide range of economic conditions by having a tuition policy based on what a family can afford to pay. This has been translated into a sliding tuition scale based on family income. The tuition scale and number of enrolled children at each level is outlined below. Figures are in hourly terms simply for ease of accounting; enrollment policy requires a child to be enrolled for at least two days a week.

Income level	Tuition per hour	Days enrolled per week
I. Over $25,000	$1.45	16
II. $20,000 to $24,999	1.30	4
III. $16,000 to $19,999	1.15	13½
IV. $9,000 to $15,999	1.00	5
V. $6,500 to $8,999	.50	9
VI. Below $6,500	.35	5

There are no limitations on income or the number of children that will be accepted at each income level. In order to meet expenses, however, the program requires an overall average of $1.00 per hour per child and full enrollment. The admissions policy is geared to producing such an average.

PROPOSED FUNDING

The hard economic facts are that families with less money are likely to want Wee Care full-time and those with more money are likely to want Wee Care part-time (2 or 3 days a week). It is also true, in our experience, that there is simply greater demand for Wee Care among low-income parents. Thus, the two facts, specific demand for full-time care and general demand for any child care service at all, both of which are greatest among lower income families, combine to make virtually impossible meeting these greatest demands for the program's services because the necessary financial balance is not provided through equal demand from upper-income parents.

BOARD MEMBERS OF WEE CARE

Acting President—Mrs. Sherrilynn Smith. (Parent) (July 1, 1974–August 15, 1974).

President—Mrs. Karen Fleischer. (Parent).

Vice-President—Mr. Will Riggan. (Parent).

Secretary—Mrs. Darcy Bacon. (Parent).

Treasurer—Mrs. Ursula King. (Parent).

Comptroller—Dr. Richard Smith. (Parent).

Educational Director—Mrs. Nancy Goodell. (Community Member). B.A. in Early Childhood Education and Special Education from the University of Nebraska; graduate work at the University of Nebraska and George Washington University in Early Childhood Development and Special Education; taught mentally retarded 5–8 year olds for one year; taught in a convalescent home in England for one year, Children ages 3–6; Taught 2 years in an inner city school, emotionally disturbed children ages 6–10; helped to set up the nursery school program at Junior Village in Washington, D.C., and taught 4 year olds; helped to set up the training program for nursery school teachers, taught 3 years olds at Capital East Children's Center, and is on the Board of Directors of Capital East Children's Center; on the Board of Directors of the Washington Pre-School Institute; mother of two children ages 4⅓ and 3.

Members—Mrs. Bernadette Holton. (Community Member); Mrs. Audrea Hurt. (Day Care Parent); Mrs. Ann Kolker. (Parent); Mrs. Margaret Missiaen. (Parent).

Members Ex Officio—Mrs. Helga Butler, Mrs. Carol Schaffer.

EMPLOYEES OF WEE CARE

Educational Director—(part-time, 12 hours per week) Mrs. Nancy Goodell (also Board member).

Administrative Assistant—(part-time, 8 hours per week) Mrs. Audrey Jones.

Day Care Parents—Mrs. Adrea Hurt, full time (also Board Member); Mrs. Lena Evans, full time; Ms. Susan Horak, full time; Mr. Ron Bailey, 3 days per week (begins work September 3, 1974).

Aides—Mrs. Billie Ann Hurt, part-time; Ms. Maria Banks, part-time.

STATEMENT OF NANCY GOODELL

My name is Nancy Goodell. I am the mother of two children, a five-year-old girl and a three-year-old boy, both of whom will be at the Children's Center this fall. I was the teacher for the three-year-old group at the Center the first year of its operation. Since then, I have been active as a board member and involved as a parent in the program.

My educational and professional background is in Child Development and Early Childhood Education. I am presently the Educational Director of Wee Care, a non-profit child care organization for one to three year olds.

I would like to tell you about the program and express my great concern and support for the passage of your joint Child and Family Services Bill.

Wee Care has been operating for almost two years. Its origins are similar to those of the Children's Center. Three years ago a group of Capitol Hill parents and community people began to be very concerned about the scarcity of child care facilities for their children under three years of age. Good, reliable baby sitters are difficult to find, and day care centers, if available to the under three, are not really what the group had in mind. The group was a diverse one, racially and economically. Single parents, working mothers, and non-working mothers, who wanted part-time care and a social experience for their children, were involved. After months of research, talking to child care experts, and endless discussions, the group decided to develop a program that would:

1. Be appropriate for young children who still need a great deal of "mothering" and much individual attention.
2. Be available to low-income as well as middle and high income families.
3. Provide dependable employment for women interested in early childhood.
4. Provide pre-service and in-service training for the staff and the parents.

5. Have the parent and community members as the decision-making body.

In October, 1972, Wee Care became incorporated as a nonprofit organization. A sliding scale tuition program was instituted, three day care parents were hired, and I was hired to be the educational director.

The program now includes four day care homes and approximately twenty-five families.

There are five children ranging from one to three years in each home with a day care parent. The setting is homelike with bright cheerie spaces set up for the children and their varied activities. The day care parent cares for the physical, emotional, social, and educational needs of each child much as a parent would do at home. The children are given a lunch and two snacks, and can be with their day care parents from 8:30 to 5:30 five days a week.

My role has been to work with the day care parents to help them set up their homes and plan activities appropriate to the children's developmental levels. I visit the homes weekly and have workshops with the day care parents on a regular basis with topics including nutrition, first aid and health needs of young children, emotional needs; toilet training, separation anxiety, and language development.

The parents, day care parents, and I also meet every six to eight weeks, These meetings are for informal discussions concerning the children and their development. We talk about what it is like to be a parent, and we discuss problems and ideas relating to the care of the children at home and in the day care homes. The parents and day care parents also make plans for making and securing equipment for the day care home.

As you can see, many of the requirements you have specified in your Child and Family Services Bills are similar to the kinds of things the Wee Care parents have thought to be important and worth struggling for.

And I must say that *it is* a struggle to operate a program such as the one I have described.

It is very expensive, and our finances have been limited. Our only source of income has been parent tuition and parent-run benefits.

It is extremely expensive to have a sliding fee tuition scale, to provide substitutes for the day care mothers, to pay social security, to provide sick leave and vacation leave for the day care mothers, to provide adequate equipment for each home, to provide nutritious food, and to provide a training program. The parents and staff feel strongly about all of these things and since there have not been sufficient funds, all of us on the staff have had to work incredible hours for very little pay, and we have had to depend upon dedicated parents and community people to voluntarily administer the program. I am talking about as much as twenty to thirty hours per week of volunteer time for some parents. It is difficult to maintain that level for long. But Wee Care with its sliding fee scale would fold without it.

This is why we are so concerned about the passage of your bills. We have demonstrated that quality day care with a mixed socio-economic group is possible, but it will be your leadership in passing S. 3754 and HR 15882 that will determine whether this kind of program can be sustained and expanded.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN M. HORAK

Since graduating from college two years ago, I have been involved in the area of education in several capacities. My experiences make me, in part, the person I am with definite commitments, concerns, and priorities. I am strongly committed to the concept of day care, feeling that children and parents deserve effective, varied day care programs to choose from within their communities.

As a permanent substitute teacher in a middle school and high school in a small New Jersey community, I was exposed to children of different age levels, backgrounds, and needs. My job required an ability to closely observe a child and quickly come to understand him or her in order to attempt to be a teacher. I did become aware of how unique children are as individuals, how quickly they learn, how they demand love and attention, and the opportunity to grow toward becoming positive, fulfilled adults.

I spent one year at a private Quaker boarding school as an English teacher. Working with adolescents as a teacher, live-in counselor, and academic advisor, I strived to help adolescents who were struggling with their identities and initiation into an adult world of considerable threat, financial demands, complicated personal relationships, and political insecurity. As an individual, I was offended by the class conscious exclusiveness of the school, its social rigidity, and felt disillusioned by what I felt was a rather smug and very intellectual social "consciousness". I found that my struggle, as an individual, did not go beyond the grounds of the campus and that many of the parents and students were worried about getting into Vassar or Harvard while others, I knew, struggled for basic education, equality, and very basic survival needs.

Consequently, as a person interested in and committed to education, I wanted to teach in a day care center a great deal. I feel that day care is the right of every child and parent. Furthermore, I feel that communities should have a variety of programs to choose from to meet specific needs and personalities of children and adults alike. I feel that it is extremely vital for the Children and Family Services Bill be passed. I am tired and embittered in view of the picture of federal funding for day care and other educational and social programs. Too many times, bills have been rejected by our representatives and top administrators. Corruption, egoism, and political cunning are reflections of top priorities. This reality, as I perceive it, can change. I hope that our political representatives can and will meet the challenge of political and social renewal this year and in time to follow. Our children grow quickly into adults who make decisions and deal with a world that may be even more baffling than the present one. They have a right to opportunities that good day care provides, i.e. opportunity to grow up secure, loved, with chances to learn, play, be creative, and be understood.

I think that it is vital for all of you to understand and be aware of Wee Care's personal situation and the struggle we are dealing with. Wee Care is not an isolated organization. Many other day care centers in D.C. alone share our problems. On the other hand, many other day care teachers I have come to know personally, are shocked when they inquire about the conditions under which Wee Care has managed to survive. These are the people whose organizations are still funded through bills and grants given some time ago.

I feel a great deal of concern for the position of parents involved with Wee Care. Parental responsibility includes weekly food shopping, for which parents are reimbursed twice a month. Wee Care provides home prepared meals and snacks daily. Alternatives were discussed but thought to be more difficult to implement. A short time ago, teachers did all of the shopping for their homes and were reimbursed once a month. Taking money from personal funds is difficult when working at minimal salary, which we do. Parents also help with cleanup, supplying or managing to secure equipment such as dishes and toys, as well as administrate the organization, for the most part, on a purely voluntary basis. Needless to say, these parents are dedicated, concerned, and willing to give freely of their time in order to ensure that their day care home continues to be a good one. Teachers often feel that they are imposing when they collect money for a small swimming pool, pass out shopping lists, and ask for a great deal of free time from working parents. The parents realize, however, that this is the means by which Wee Care can survive.

I feel most strongly about the tuition that parents must pay to Wee Care. One parent from an upper income level informed me that she must pay twice as much in Washington for day care as she paid for a similar program in Berkely, California. Even for her, Wee Care tuition is a burden. I was infuriated at and saddened by the ordeal of another woman. She had finally gotten off of Welfare and secured a job as a dental receptionist. Working day and night hours, she was supporting her family and putting her husband through Howard University. Her child had previously been cared for by his elderly grandmother who lived with the family. He had little contact with other children, few opportunities to verbalize or play outside in a park. This child had a difficult adjustment period at Wee Care. I worked closely with our Educational Director, Nancy Goodell concerning separation anxiety, speech problems, lack of energy, and security. Within two weeks, this child had adjusted reasonably well. He was happy to come to his day care house and I was stimulated and challenged, seeing that we were doing good things for him. This woman found that she could not possibly afford our lowest fee for tuition and had to withdraw her child from our program. I asked her to bring him back any time, as long as I had a free space for him. At that time, we had no scholarship funds available. Of course, she refused my suggestion feeling proud and rightly so, knowing that she would manage. We have organized a scholarship drive which I am working on with one of the mothers in my center. There may be other programs which this boy's mother can afford. However, I still feel in agreement with his mother's opinion that Wee Care provided the type of atmosphere and situation that his needs called for at that time.

The position of teachers in Wee Care is something I can speak of with a sense of crisis. Our hours are long and demanding—something which we accept, of course, but for which we feel that we deserve adequate payment. For a long time, Wee Care teachers worked a ninth hour per day for which they did not receive overtime. Only recently, the board established overtime pay. Some of us are concerned about back overtime pay which we are legally entitled to. Proposed benefits and fund raising events show the board's concern and desire to provide what we deserve. Our reluctance to discuss this matter much less ask for the money reflect that we understand that Wee Care should fold if put under this particular financial strain. Our salary is of major concern to ouselves, to parents, and to the board. We are paid two dollars and twenty-five cents per hour. I am finding it nearly impossible to pay off my college loans, much less pursue graduate school which is a personal priortiy. We receive a two week paid vacation per year which is our only benefit. Without medical or other benefits, it is extremely difficult to meet these expenses totally independently. As a certified teacher, I could be making a much higher salary, as I am reminded by my parents and other people. I do not particularly care about money. I just want to be able to meet my living expenses and save a little. I feel a strong commitment to Wee Care and to the overall concept of day care. I find myself willing to give some time and struggle with real financial strain in order to try to help these causes. For one thing, bills such as the one that you have proposed, make me hopeful that my attitude is not naive or too idealistic. I think that federal funding is essential; not an unrealistic demand but an entirely justified priority.

All of the problems Wee Care teachers try to surmount seem to involve finances. I run a full time center for children between the ages of one to three. These children are, of course, very young and require constant close attention. I do not have an aide and Wee Care cannot afford to hire one. One aide who worked for Wee Care made a total of ten cents per week after taking out money for transportation and immediate expenses. This may seem somewhat ludicrous. This young woman gained excellent work experience and exposure, however, her financial responsibilities few as they may seem to others are very real to herself.

There are crucial problems other than salary dilemmas. They are of great concern to us. I certainly do not mean to ramble through a list of complaints or demands. I am only presenting a very general and incomplete sketch of our situation. We desperately require federal funding in order to operate. We are making a strong effort but find ourselves increasingly closed in, left with few alternatives to explore. We are open to change but are running out of helpful and constructive means to do so. Wee Care is simply an organization that needs major outside attention and aide. We provide an excellent and vital service to our society. I feel that we deserve some sacrifice and committment from our government which is to serve all of us.

[Excerpt from the Congressional Record—House, June 11, 1974]

General Accounting Office Reports on Local Government Use of Revenue Sharing Funds for Handicapped, Children, and Elderly

The **Speaker** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Brademas) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **Brademas**. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in Seattle, Wash., I had the privilege of participating in a discussion of "Congress and the States" at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Governors.

During the discussion, in response to questions from some of the Governors, I cited the results of a study I had requested the General Accounting Office to make of the extent to which revenue sharing funds had been used by local governments for two groups of persons: handicapped people of all ages and children.

In my reply, I also cited the results of another GAO study requested by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Claude Pepper of Florida, who had asked about the use by local units of government of revenue sharing funds to assist the elderly.

Not only as a Member of Congress but as chairman of the House Select Education Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over a number of programs to aid the handicapped, young children, and the elderly, I am concerned about the extent to which revenue sharing moneys are used for persons in our society who may be accurately described as vulnerable.

The results of these GAO studies with respect to how much local governmental units have been using revenue sharing funds for these three groups is, to say the least, most disquieting.

Here, in brief, is what the Comptroller General of the United States reported, in a letter to me, dated May 30, 1974, which I shall include in the Record. I shall also include in the Record the Comptroller General's letter to Congressman Pepper of February 13, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, based on a survey of 250 local governments—selected "primarily on the basis of dollar significance and geographical dispersion" and which "included the 50 cities and 50 counties that received the largest amounts of revenue sharing funds for calendar year 1972" and subject to the limitations on the analysis set forth in the Comptroller General's letter of May 30, 1974—here are the basic findings.

I should, Mr. Speaker, note that, according to the Comptroller General:

"The necessary legal and procedural steps were taken by 219 governments to authorize the expenditure of $1.374 billion of these funds.

"A total of 18 governments authorized part of their revenue sharing funds in programs or activities for the handicapped.

"These authorizations totaled about $4.3 million, or about three-tenths of 1 percent of the $1.374 billion authorized by the 219 governments.

"A total of 52 governments authorized part of their revenue sharing funds in children's programs or activities. These authorizations totaled about $15.4 million, or a little more than 1 percent of the $1.374 billion authorized by the 219 governments."

According to the February 13, 1974, letter to Congressman Pepper from the Comptroller General:

"Of the 219 governments, 28 authorized the expenditure of part of their revenue sharing funds in programs or activities specifically and exclusively for the benefit of the elderly.

"These authorizations totaled about $2.9 million, or about two-tenths of 1 percent of the total funds authorized for expenditure by the 219 governments."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate these findings.

According to the General Accounting Office, local units of Government are using of their revenue sharing funds about three-tenths of 1 percent for handicapped persons, a little more than 1 percent for children's programs, and about two-thirds of 1 percent for the benefit of the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, to be as gentle about the point as possible, this record is not impressive and simply supports the apprehensions that many of us in Congress expressed about revenue sharing when it was first launched with extravagant and pretentious claims.

Although the State and Local Fiscal Act of 1972 (P.L. 92–512), which authorized revenue sharing, is aimed at giving State and local governments flexibility in using the funds, the statute also requires them to be spent within specified, but extensive priority areas, including health and social services for the poor or aged.

As I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, the record to date, based on the evidence presented by the General Accounting Office, shows that local units of government are almost totally ignoring the needs of three of the neediest groups in our society, the handicapped, children, and the elderly.

These are not the groups, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, with the greatest political influence at the local, or State, level, and it ought therefore not to be surprising that they see so little of the benefits of revenue sharing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that, in approving revenue sharing, Congress did not intend that all the revenue sharing money should be expended on the handicapped, children, and the elderly.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, we should be able to expect a better record than the one which I have just reported.

Mr. Speaker, I for one find these reports most troubling.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the text of the two letters to which I have earlier referred—that of May 30, 1974, to me from the Comptroller

General and that of February 13, 1974, to Congressman Pepper:
(The following matter is quoted:)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 30, 1974.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your February 19, 1974, request, we have analyzed the data we collected on the disposition of revenue sharing funds by 250 local governments to determine the extent to which the funds were being targeted for handicapped people of all ages and children. A more general description of the uses of revenue sharing funds by these governments and our views on certain accountability aspects of revenue sharing are contained in our report entitled, "Revenue Sharing: Its Use by and Impact on Local Governments" (B-146285, Apr. 25, 1974), which has been provided to your office.

The Revenue Sharing Act (Public Law 92-512) provided for distributing approximately $30.2 billion to States and local governments for a 5-year program. The Office of Revenue Sharing, Department of the Treasury, made initial payments under the revenue sharing program in December 1972 and had distributed about $6.6 billion through June 30, 1973, to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and about 38,000 local governments. Approximately one-third of the funds were distributed to the States and the remaining two-thirds to local governments.

One objective of revenue sharing is to give State and local governments flexibility in using funds. Therefore, the act provides only general guidance on how local governments can use the funds by requiring them to be spent within specified, but quite extensive, priority areas. The areas are: maintenance and operating expenses for public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor or aged, and financial administration. In addition, a local government may use the funds for any ordinary and necessary capital expenditure.

We selected the 250 governments primarily on the basis of dollar significance and geographical dispersion. Our selection included the 50 cities and 50 counties that received the largest amounts of revenue sharing funds for calendar year 1972. The 250 governments received about $1.658 billion through June 30, 1973, or about 38 percent of the approximately $4.4 billion distributed to all local governments.

Including interest earnings on the revenue sharing funds through June 30, 1973, about $1.688 billion was available for use by the 250 governments. The necessary legal and procedural steps were taken by 219 governments to authorize the expenditure of $1.374 billion of these funds. The remaining 31 governments had not authorized the expenditure of any of the funds. As your office agreed, we analyzed the purposes for which the 219 governments had authorized expenditure of revenue sharing funds.

LIMITATIONS ON ANALYSIS

We did not accumulate specific data on revenue sharing funds authorized for the handicapped or children. We did obtain reasonably specific information, however, on the purposes for which the governments had earmarked revenue sharing funds. Therefore, we believe the data presented in this report indicates fairly the extent that the funds were being targeted toward these two groups. In certain instances the local governments had authorized the funds at a broad program or activity level without identifying the projects or activities to be financed. Some of these authorizations might result in the expenditure of funds for the handicapped or children.

The data we collected on the use of revenue sharing funds was derived primarily from the Governments' financial records. Because of the nature of revenue sharing, the actual effects of the funds may be different from the uses indicated by financial records.

When a government uses revenue sharing to wholly or partially finance a program which would have been financed from its own resources, other uses may be made of its own freed resources. Freed funds may be used for such things as tax reductions, increasing the funding for other programs, and reducing the amount of outstanding debt.

Because of such factors as changing amounts of revenue available to a government from its own sources and changing budgetary priorities, it is exceedingly difficult, and perhaps impossible in some jurisdictions, to identify objectively the actual effects of revenue sharing. Therefore, revenue sharing's effect on the local government's assistance programs for the handicapped and children could be substantially different from that indicated by the information in this report. Also, this report contains no data on the extent to which such programs are being financed from other sources. Thus, a particular government may have earmarked no revenue sharing funds for the handicapped on children but nonetheless have significant programs in these areas.

PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

A total of 18 governments authorized part of their revenue sharing funds in programs or activities for the handicapped. These authorizations totaled about $4.3 million, or about three-tenths of 1 percent of the $1,374 billion authorized by the 219 governments. Enclosure I briefly describe the programs for the handicapped that were being financed with revenue sharing funds by the 18 governments. When a program was directed toward handicapped children, we classified it as a program for the handicapped. The more significant programs included:

Suffolk County, New York, authorized $2,104,702 for three programs consisting of $991,235 for transporting physically handicapped children to school, $716,087 for the physical rehabilitation of children with such medical problems as chronic diseases, and $397,380 for physical therapy and recreation for the emotionally disturbed.

Passaic County, New Jersey, appropriated $1,400,419 for assisting mental health programs primarily to maintain patients in State institutions for the mentally disabled.

Fresno County, California, appropriated $225,000 to purchase and remodel a hotel for use as a rehabilitation center for the mentally ill.

Portland, Oregon, appropriated $67,000 for the handicapped. Of this, $45,000 was to renovate recreation buildings, including installing ramps and modifying restrooms. The other $22,000 was for providing ramps at curbs on city streets.

PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

A total of 52 governments authorized part of their revenue sharing funds in children's programs or activities. These authorizations totaled about $15.4 million, or a little more than 1 percent of the $1.374 billion authorized by the 219 governments. Enclosure II briefly describes the programs being funded by revenue sharing. The more significant programs included:

Suffolk County, New York, authorized $1,953,456 for three programs consisting of $1,400,356 for payments to foster parents for foster care, $507,099 for juvenile delinquent institutional care, and $46,001 for a youth service program.

Riverside County, California, appropriated $1,226,563 for several projects, including $577,144 for constructing a juvenile detention hall and $546,000 for constructing an office building for the juvenile probation department.

Los Angeles County, California, appropriated $1,062,054 for juvenile probation activities, including $487,621 for capital improvements at juvenile halls and $457,450 for capital improvements at several boys probation camps.

Baltimore, Maryland, authorized $1 million for summer youth activities consisting of $650,000 for a youth employment program directed toward the disadvantaged and $350,000 for a recreation program directed toward inner city children and the handicapped.

We do not plan to distribute this report further unless you agree or publicly announce its contents.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

ENCLOSURE I

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAD AUTHORIZED REVENUE SHARING FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED AS OF JUNE 30, 1973

Government	Amount authorized: Capital outlay	Amount authorized: Operation and maintenance	Nature of expenditure
Anchorage, Alaska	$38,500		Modification of city buildings for handicapped.
	14,400		Curb cuts for handicapped.
Baton Rouge, La		$22,000	Mental health center.
Burlington, Vt		10,898	Visiting nurse service for chronically ill and disabled.
Fargo, N. Dak	50,000		Mountable curbs for handicapped.
Fremont County, Wyo	10,000		School for retarded children.
Fresno County, Calif	225,000		Mental health building.
Fulton County, Ga		40,000	Mental health.
Jackson County, Mo	67,150		Hearing disability diagnostic center.
		37,731	Recreation program for the handicapped.
		43,746	Mental health.
Jefferson County, Ala	23,750		Improved mental health facilities.
King County, Wash		7,476	Mentally handicapped.
		6,375	Physically handicapped.
Monroe County, N.Y		21,678	Mental health.
Navajo County, Ariz	8,000		Mental health facilities.
Passaic County, N.J		1,400,419	Mental health.
Portland, Oreg	22,000		Curbs and ramps for handicapped.
	45,000		Modification of recreation facilities for handicapped.
Prince Georges County, Md		45,564	Mental hospitals.
Toledo, Ohio		50,000	County mental health and retardation board.
Suffolk County, N.Y		991,235	Transportation of handicapped children.
		716,087	Physical rehabilitation of children.
		397,380	Mental health.
Sullivan County, Ind		8,000	Do.
Total	503,800	3,798,589	

Note: After June 30, 1973, funds could be reauthorized for other purposes before expenditure. Some governments authorized revenue sharing funds already received, as well as anticipated receipts. In such cases, the amounts shown above represent a proration of the amounts appropriated, to reflect appropriations of funds received through June 30, 1973.

ENCLOSURE II

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAD AUTHORIZED REVENUE SHARING FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN, AS OF JUNE 30, 1973

Government	Amount authorized: Capital outlay	Amount authorized: Operation and maintenance	Nature of expenditure
Ada County, Idaho	$700,000		Juvenile home.
Anchorage, Alaska		$22,000	Youth programs—Boys Club and Camp Fire Girls.
Baltimore, Md		350,000	Summer youth recreation.
		650,000	Summer youth employment.
Baton Rouge, La	50,000		Family court detention center.
Butler County, Ohio		4,500	Neighborhood youth bureau.
Charleston County, S.C		147,000	School guards.
Cincinnati, Ohio		25,000	Playhouse in park.
Clark County, Nev	100,000		Juvenile court services.
Columbia, S.C		50,000	Day care center.
Columbus, Ohio	304,450		Playground renovation.
	25,000		Playground development.
		210,000	Summer youth program.
		72,500	Youth services bureau.
Cuyahoga County, Ohio		212,029	Juvenile court.
Denver, Colo		482,250	Summer youth employment.
El Paso, Tex	100,000		School zone signs and markings.
	90,000		Playground equipment.
Fargo, N. Dak		50,000	Summer youth employment.
Fort Worth, Tex		22,516	Youth services program.
Fresno County, Calif	50,000		Schools (air-conditioning).
	22,413		Juvenile hall.
Fulton County, Ga		694,780	Children's services.
	278,000		Juvenile court, renovate building and satellite centers.

ENCLOSURE II—Continued

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAD AUTHORIZED REVENUE SHARING FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN, AS OF JUNE 30, 1973—Continued

Government	Amount authorized		Nature of expenditure
	Capital outlay	Operation and maintenance	
Hartford, Conn	126,996		Improving school buildings, school parking lots, and bleachers.
Isle of Palms, S.C		325	Tot lot equipment.
Jackson County, Mo		68,354	Children's Mercy Hospital.
		27,342	Youth service center.
Jacksonville, Fla	48,092		Playground equipment.
Jefferson County, Ala		240,000	Family court (juveniles).
Jefferson Parish, La		155,971	Juvenile detention home.
Kanawha County, W. Va	4,012		Child shelter.
Kansas City, Mo		295,758	Summer neighborhood youth corps.
		15,987	Youth opportunity program.
		9,992	Youth program, coaches council.
Las Vegas, Nev	110,000		Teen center expansion.
Los Angeles County, Calif	487,621		Juvenile halls.
	457,450		Boys Camp (probation).
	76,888		Juvenile courts building.
		40,095	Youth foundation.
Louisville, Ky	500,000		Youth center for performing arts.
		83,125	School traffic guards.
McLean County, Ill		47,579	Juvenile probation.
Milwaukee County, Wis		642,339	Children's court center, detention.
Milwaukee, Wis		300,000	School health services.
		155,000	School crossing guards.
		115,000	Child health services.
Monroe County, N.Y		66,997	Youth employment program.
		15,893	School health programs.
	20,190		Children's detention.
New Orleans, La		2,745	Juvenile court.
Portland, Oreg	22,600		Playground equipment.
	31,500		Wading pools.
Prince Georges County, Md		276,891	School crossing guards.
		74,772	School security.
Pulaski County, Ark		5,000	Children's hospital.
		1,036	Boy Scouts.
Richmond, Va	885,000		Air condition high school.
Riverside County, Calif	624,132		Juvenile halls.
	546,000		Probation (juvenile office).
	31,300		Juvenile court.
	1,502		Youth center.
		23,629	Summer youth program.
Sacramento County, Calif	200,000		Children's receiving home.
		5,250	Summer camp.
St. Louis County, Mo		100,000	Summer youth employment program.
		5,250	Summer camp.
	40,000		Center for boys.
St. Louis, Mo	3,953		Playground equipment.
	1,168		Child guidance equipment.
San Antonio, Tex	6,745	68,255	Youth service project.
	43,525	56,475	School sidewalks.
San Diego, Calif		440,000	Summer youth program.
Santa Clara County, Calif		50,000	Summer youth employment.
Shelby County, Tenn	700,000		Addition to high school.
Silver Bow County, Mont		6,000	Summer (recreation) school program.
Suffolk County, N.Y		1,400,356	Foster care.
		507,099	Juvenile delinquent care.
		46,001	Youth services program.
Tampa, Fla	50,000		Playground equipment.
Toledo, Ohio		100,000	Summer youth employment.
Tulare County, Calif	75,000		Juvenile hall, site development.
Ventura County, Calif		125,000	Summer youth employment.
Wichita, Kans		50,000	Summer neighborhood youth corps.
		6,667	Youth development program.
		5,195	Day care center.
		2,176	Summer youth employment.
Total	6,813,537	8,624,879	

Note: After June 30, 1973, funds could be reauthorized for other purposes before expenditure. Some governments authorized revenue sharing funds already received, as well as anticipated receipts. In such cases, the amounts shown above represent a proration of the amounts appropriated, to reflect appropriations of funds received through June 30, 1973.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1974.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: Your November 14, 1973, letter requested that we report on the extent to which general revenue sharing funds are being allocated to programs specifically and exclusively designed to benefit the elderly.

As agreed with your office, we analyzed data we had gathered as of June 30, 1973, on the uses of revenue sharing funds by 250 selected local governments. Although we did not specifically accumulate data on funds allocated by the 250 governments exclusively for the benefit of the elderly, we did obtain data on the types of programs or activities being financed wholly or partially with revenue sharing funds. Accordingly, we believe that from this data we can make a reasonably accurate estimate of the extent to which these governments had allocated the funds to programs specifically intended to assist the elderly.

The Revenue Sharing Act (Public Law 92-512) provided for the distribution of approximately $30.2 billion to State and local governments for a 5-year program period. The Office of Revenue Sharing, Department of the Treasury, made initial payments under the Revenue Sharing program in December 1972 and had distributed about $6.6 billion through June 30, 1973, to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and about 38,000 units of local government. Approximately one-third of the funds were distributed to the States and the remaining two-thirds to local governments.

One of the objectives of revenue sharing is to provide State and local governments with flexibility in using the funds. Accordingly, the act provides only general guidance as to how local governments can use the funds by requiring them to be spent within a specified, but quite extensive, list of priority areas. The priority areas are: maintenance and operating expenses for public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor or aged, and financial administration. In addition, a local government may use the funds for any ordinary and necessary capital expenditure.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS INCLUDED IN ANALYSIS

We selected the 250 governments primarily on the basis of dollar significance and geographical dispersion. The selection included the 50 cities and the 50 counties that received the largest amounts of revenue sharing funds for calendar year 1972. The 250 governments received about $1,658 billion through June 30, 1973, or about 38 percent of the approximate $4.4 billion distributed to all local governments.

FUNDS USED TO ASSIST THE ELDERLY

Including interest earnings on the revenue sharing funds through June 30, 1973, about $1,688 billion was available for use by the 250 governments. The necessary legal and procedural steps were taken by 218 of the governments to authorize the expenditure of $1,374 billion of these funds. The remaining 32 governments did not authorize the expenditure of any of the funds.

Of the 218 governments, 28 authorized the expenditure of part of their revenue sharing funds in programs or activities specifically and exclusively for the benefit of the elderly. These authorizations totaled about $2.9 million, or about two-tenths of 1 percent of the total funds authorized for expenditure by the 218 governments.

Expenditures designated to benefit the elderly ranged from a low of $1,000 appropriated by Brighton, Vermont for operating and maintaining a senior citizens center to a high of $785,816 appropriated for Pima county, Arizona, for purchasing a nursing home used primarily for care of the indigent elderly. Pima county had obtained the nursing home under a lease-purchase arrangement and used revenue sharing funds to exercise the purchase option.

The other 26 governments were financing a variety of programs for the elderly. The more significant programs included the following:

Jersey City appropriated $400,000 to finance a public transportation discount program for senior citizens.

Sacramento county appropriated $104,254 to finance a project being undertaken by the Sacramento County Legal Aid Society to provide legal services to the elderly.

Jefferson county, Alabama, authorized use of $45,000 in revenue sharing funds received through June 30, 1973, to add an 83-bed wing to the county nursing home for the indigent aged. An additional $150,000 was to be used to acquire equipment for the new wing.

Kansas City earmarked $100,000 for a nutrition program for the elderly that was expected to provide food for 600 persons a day.

Clark County, Nevada, appropriated $125,000 to acquire a building for use as a senior citizens center. The center will provide hobby, recreational, and social activities. An additional $25,000 was earmarked for renovating the building. This project was being jointly undertaken with Las Vegas, which was participating in the initial capital costs and will be responsible for operating the center.

LIMITATIONS ON DATA

The data on the extent to which the selected governments used revenue sharing funds to assist the elderly was obtained primarily from governments' financial records and therefore represents the direct uses of the funds. Because of the inherent nature of the Revenue Sharing program, the actual results or effects of the funds may be different from the uses indicated by financial records.

When a recipient government uses revenue sharing to wholly or partially finance a program, which was previously financed or which would have been financed from its own resources, other uses may be made of its own freed resources. Freed local funds may be used for such things as tax reductions, increasing the level of funding for other programs, reducing the amount of outstanding debt, and so forth.

Because of such factors as changing amounts of revenue available to a government from its own sources and changing budgetary priorities, it is exceedingly difficult, and perhaps impossible in some jurisdictions, to objectively identify the actual results or effects or revenue sharing. Accordingly, in considering the information presented in this report, you should be aware that the actual effect the revenue sharing program may have on the local governments' assistance programs for the elderly could be different from that indicated.

* * * * * * *

We do not plan to make further distribution of this report unless you agree or publicly announce its contents.

We trust the above information is responsive to your needs.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER,
Comptroller General of the United States.

(End of quoted matter.)

A PARTIAL STATEMENT OF NEEDS AND SERVICES OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT FOR PUERTO RICANS IN NEW JERSEY

PREFACE

A report[1] recently issued by the Puerto Rican Congress presented the following data:

TABLE 1.—PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN SELECTED DISTRICTS READING BELOW AGE LEVEL, BY ETHNICITY AND GRADE, 1972

Grade	Puerto Ricans	Blacks	Continental whites
1	62	38	7
2	68	47	20
3	75	58	36
4	60	53	41
5	73	78	34
6	80	51	48

---

[1] "The Educators" a chapter of *The Puerto Rican Experience: An Educational Research Study*. Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, 1973.

This table implies three (3) very important things about the New Jersey education system: *One*, that Puerto Ricans are disadvantaged from the very beginning (grade one) due to the monolingual delivery system (English and not Spanish/English)—62% of Puerto Ricans reading below grade level in grade one as opposed to 38% for Blacks and 7% for Continental Whites; *two*, that despite the so-called built-in advantage of Continental Whites, by grade six that advantage has become less and somewhat neuralized—48% Continental Whites reading below grade level compared to 51% for Black youngsters; *three*, that significantly more Puerto Ricans are reading below grade level by the sixth grade than is true of both Blacks and Continental Whites (80% vs 51%/48%).

We suggest a relationship between this data and a second stark fact: in New Jersey, in 1974, just 122 pre-school children receive full day care under the auspices of Puerto Rican and Hispanic sponsorship.

We do not contend that child development programs must emphasize cognitive development. We do contend that local project sponsors must have the opportunity and latitude to embrace a curricular approach which meets the needs and desires of the consumers of the service, which may well emphasize preparation for cognitive development.

Research has indicated that a child's learning pattern is shaped during his/her first five years. When parents are unavailable to provide nurturing—due to the need to work, sometimes due to family problems or indifference—the child suffers possibly irreparable developmental damage. And even where parents are loving and attentive, a quality child development program can serve as a wholesome supplement to the family. Good child care is fun. The child plays and learns with other children under supervision, has community cultural values reinforced, has nutritional food and medical attention, has a regular rest period, has stimulating toys.

Good child care involves the parent intimately. He/she makes policy decision about who should care and help develop the child and under what conditions. He/she interacts with—contributes to and learns from—the child's experience in a center. He/she is acquainted with community resources and fellow parents, and hopefully acculturates to expect the same kind of responsivity from the public educational system as exists in a good child development program.

We further submit that the concept of bilingualism is a wholesome one for English—dominant as well as non-English dominant children and youth.

We also emphasize child development as a part of community development. There is an intrinsic value to our society at large to enable local groups, including consumers of services, to engage in the frequently frustrating process of initiating and building their own institution to deliver needed services. The process provides concrete experience in the areas of politics, administration, education, health and social service which can be and is applied in personal lives as well as other community efforts. We believe that for our community to develop collectively, we must have widespread involvement in child development decision-making. This approach—child, family, community development—results in a rich and consistent experience for the young child, and access to community resources—health, social service, and education—for the entire family.

And we also look forward to our adults continuing their education and being responsible child development staff members and administrators.

Child development delivery in New Jersey

Many people talk about child care in New Jersey, but no one, apparently, has yet provided an accurate, clear comprehensive statement of (1) who receives what services (2) from what funding sources and (3) what segment of total demand, or need, is served presently. Our intention here is to contribute to this goal in this paper, while continuing to ferret out the missing information.

Programs and enrollment, 1973

One recent approximation of Public Day Care Centers and Pre-School Programs showed the following:

TABLE 2[1].—APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF PUBLIC DAY CARE CENTERS AND PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS (FULL DAY) 1973

Program	Number of centers	Children served
Head Start (full day)	80	2,248
Head Start (half day)	104	3,097
Head Start (summer)	38	1,440
Early childhood development demonstration centers	4	[1] 170
Community contracted title IV–A	120	[1] 7,096
Day care 100	22	1,440
Non-WIN division operated[2]	9	[1] 600
WIN	9	[1] 510
Title I[3]	25	2,432
Title III[3]	3	171
Total	414	19,204

[1] From "Day Care in New Jersey", draft, unpublished. Here, care, some part-day, for 19,204 children is logged. More recent DYFS data suggests that the total number of children served by DYFS has increased by 3,000 since table 2 was developed.

[2] Operated by Division of Youth and Family Services.

[3] There may be additional half day programs.

Educational program enrollment, 3 and 4 year olds, 1969

1970 Census data is available for children three and four years old who were enrolled in 1969 in a program with an educational objective. Though this data cannot be equated conclusively with child development or day care enrollment, the statistics yielded are instructive.

TABLE 3.—ENROLLMENT OF 3 AND 4 YEAR OLD CHILDREN IN NEW JERSEY IN AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM, 1969

	N	Percent total	Percent of all 3 and 4 year olds
White	28,478	80.3	13.5
Black	6,456	18.1	17.5
Puerto Rican	643	1.9	7.5
Total	35,245		14.2

Note: Figures are not available on enrollment by family income nor of full versus part day program length. We speculate, however, that Whites were, in the main, enrolled in part-day nonpublic programs—nursery schools—, while blacks and Puerto Ricans predominately were in full day centers.

* * * * * * *

ESTIMATES OF NEED

Poverty level

Using the low-level definition of poverty deployed by the U.S. Census Bureau as a basis for eligibility, Table 5 presents an estimate of 21451 children 3 and 4 years of age who could be afforded a pre-school experience.

TABLE 5.—ESTIMATE OF 3- AND 4-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN IN NEW JERSEY FAMILIES BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL, 1969

	N	Percent total below poverty children	Percent total children by race/ethnicity
White	11,982	55.8	6.1
Black	10,016	46.6	28.6
Puerto Rican	2,994	[2] 13.9	34.2
Total	[1] 21,451		9.1

[1] Total is more than 100 percent because poverty index scaled by percentage of children 0- to 5 in-groups was used for children under 18 in poverty families and applied to 3- to 4-year-olds, thereby assuming an equal distribution of 0- to 5-year-olds in groups.

[2] Puerto Ricans are double counted.

Note that a majority of eligible children in poverty families are white, while 28.6% of all black children and 34.2% of all Puerto Rican children live in families with below poverty-level incomes. And of all groups, only Puerto Ricans show a constantly rising trend of population inversely related to the existing distribution of 0–18 year olds.

125% poverty level

As shown in Table 6, a universe which included 3 and 4 year olds only on the basis of belonging to a family having less than 125% of the Poverty Level yields 30,929 children.

TABLE 6.—ESTIMATE OF 3- AND 4-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN IN NEW JERSEY FAMILIES BELOW 125 PERCENT OF THE POVERTY LEVEL, 1969[1]

	N	Percent total	Percent total in categories
White	17,821	57.7	9.0
Black	13,800	44.6	39.3
Puerto Rican	4,051	13.1	46.4
Total	[2] 30,929		

[1] Puerto Ricans are double counted.

[2] Total is more than 100 percent because poverty index scaled by percentage of children 0- to 5-in-groups was used for children under 18 in poverty families and applied to 3- to 4-year-olds, thereby assuming an equal distribution of 0- to 5-year-olds in groups.

The Division of Youth and Family Services estimated conservatively that an additional 5,000 eligible children were on center waiting lists in 1973.

Note that white children in poverty families again constitute a majorty of New Jersey children in this category, while 39.3% of all black children and 46.4% of all Puerto Rican children live in families with incomes less than 125% of the poverty level.

State title IV–A eligibility standards

Currently, and since the inauguration of the New Jersey State Plan for Social Service Eligibility, children from families with income of $9,940, regardless of family size, are eligible for child care without charge, under the implementation of eligibility for "present, former, or potential public assistance recipients".

Estimating from 1970 census figures, this would embrace approximately 88% of Puerto Rican Three and Four Year Olds—7,544—and 82% of Blacks—30,250. Assuming a proportionate distribution of three and four year old children among white families, 78,262 whites, fall in this category, yielding an eligble population in the range of 116,056 Three and Four Year Olds.

Puerto Rican school enrollment, 3 and 4 year olds, by State

The enrollment of Puerto Rican three and four year olds in New Jersey are presented in Table 7, with (1) total enrollment up group and (2) enrollment of Puerto Ricans and Hispanics in other states.

The table reveals:

1. The rate of Puerto Rican enrollment is New Jersey is only slightly greater than *half* the *rate* of all 3 and 4 year olds, and less than half the Black rate of enrollment.
2. New Jersey's Puerto Ricians are enrolled at *the lowest rate* of all states for which statistics for Hispanics were available, and the *second lowest* of all states showing *Puerto Rican* enrollment.
3. The low rate of Puerto Rican enrollment in New Jersey does *not* appear to be related to *total* enrollment, nor to relative Puerto Rican per capita income nor percent of persons below the poverty level, percent of female headed households, nor rate of labor force participation of married women.

TABLE 7.—SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR 3- AND 4-YEAR-OLDS BY RACE, SELECTED STATES

	Total	White	Negro	Hispanic[1 2 3 4]	Puerto Rican	Puerto Rican percentage ranked by States	Puerto Rican per capita income ranked by States	Puerto Rican percent persons above poverty level, ranked by States
United States	12.5	12.1	14.4	11.4	10.6			
United States:								
Urban	14.8	14.5	16.0	11.9	10.7			
Rural	6.9	6.6	7.1	8.0	6.8			
Northeast	13.7	13.0	18.0	11.0	10.6			
California	20.3	20.3	20.1	[1] 14.2	14.8	1	1	1
Connecticut	19.0	18.8	20.3	[2] 13.1	11.8	3	7	6
Florida	19.1	19.4	18.3	[3] 19.5	14.4	2	2	3
Illinois	12.4	12.0	14.2	[3] 10.1	6.7	9	5	4
Massachusetts	14.0	13.6	20.3	[3] 14.9	10.7	5	9	9
New Jersey	14.2	13.5	17.5	[4] 7.5	7.4	8	4	5
New York	15.0	14.4	17.8	[4] 11.1	11.1	4	6	7
Ohio	9.5	8.5	17.0	[3] 12.1	8.8	7	3	2
Pennsylvania	10.7	9.8	17.5	[4] 10.2	10.2	6	8	8

[1] Spanish surname.
[2] Spanish heritage.
[3] Spanish language.
[4] Puerto Rican.

SUMMARY

1. Puerto Ricans as a group have distinctly and significantly lower incomes than blacks or whites.
2. A paucity of child care exists for all children who are eligible for free service in New Jersey, according to eligibility criteria.
3. Only 122 children in the entire State receive full day care delivered via Puerto Rican or Hispanic group sponsorship.
4. Accurate statistics on care for other Puerto Ricans and Hispanics are not accessible.
5. Puerto Ricans have proportionately fewer children in center care than other groups, and there is a shocking absence of available bilingual/bicultural child development opportunities.
6. Approximately 4051 three and four year old Puerto Ricans lived in families with below 125% of the census poverty level in 1970.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the state assure comprehensive child development services for an additional 600 children in centers meeting Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements delivered in bilingual bicultural settings under community auspices and sponsorship, with significant parent involvement by September 1974.
2. That the state produce and disseminate by September 1, 1974 a comprehensive statement on child development services in New Jersey per June 30th, 1974 and annually thereafter, which includes at least: (a) present forms of child care delivered *to all* children with specific reference to Puerto Ricans

and Hispanics (b) Sources of financing of each (c) levels of financing of each, (d) costs and benefit of each form, (e) plans for the succeeding year.

3. That Congreso Board and staff, with collaboration of the Puerto Rican Inter-Agency Council, monitor state progress on the above and on the establishment of a child development delivery system which results in comprehensive services for eligible Puerto Ricans and Hispanics.

FINANCING AND DELIVERING CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, BACKGROUND PAPER JUNE, 1974

INTRODUCTION

This background paper is prepared to acquaint policy makers and citizens with a description of the two major federal programs now used for financing child development services, to point out problem areas in service delivery currently as well as opportunities on the horizon for expanding services.

This paper complements "Child Development for Puerto Ricans in New Jersey: A Partial Statement of Needs and Services," Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, June 1974.

FINANCING AND DELIVERING CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Full day child development services in New Jersey are primarily financed and delivered via the following programs: Headstart and Community Day Care.

1. Headstart—Originally lodged in the Office of Economic Opportunity as part of the "War on Poverty", full day Headstart programs are administered at the federal level by the Office of Child Development, HEW. Community Action Agencies, also creations of OEO, are prime sponsor grantees. In 1973, 2,248 children in New Jersey received full day care in 80 Headstart Centers. OEO poverty criteria are used for determining eligibility. Up to 10% of the total places in the program can be filled by children from over-income families, whose parents pay income-related fees.

2. Title IVA, Community Day Care. The Department of Institutions and Agencies reported that 6,168 pre-school children were enrolled in community day care centers for fiscal year 1973, and a substantial increase took place in FW '74. The bulk of financial resources for these programs consisted of federal funds under Title IVA of the Social Security Act administered by the State.

No State appropriated funds were used for Community Day Care, except for Day Care 100 (22 Centers serving 1,440 children) and 9 other non-WIN centers.

The required matching funds were provided by United Ways, units of local and county governments, including Model Cities, and other private sources.

Under Title IVA, eligibility is determined at the State level, though approval of the Regional Office of Social and Rehabilitation Service, HEW, is required. Currently, families with incomes of $9,840 or less irrespective of family size are eligible for service without charge.

Within this constraint, eligibility is determined by the operating agency, which by law cannot be the donor to the State of the matching (non-federal) monies.

Other sources of programs include WIN, Early Childhood Development Centers, and Title I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Division of Youth and Family Services projects the operation of 13 WIN centers by the end of Fiscal Year '74. Eligibility for such centers is restricted to children of parents certified as trainable or employable under the WIN program.

The availability of child development services results from uncoordinated decisions emanating from federal officials (who determined Headstart grants), state officials (who determine the placement of WIN and non-WIN State operated projects), and public and private donors at the County and municipal levels (who choose to donate resources to the State in order to assure services in their locale).

OBSTACLES TO PROVISION OF SERVICE

While the obstacles described here to increasing the delivery of child development services apply in all communities and among all ethnic groups, we are offering this description on the basis of the experiences in the Puerto Rican and Hispanic communities.

1. *Funds*

Under Title IV–A, the federal government will provide 75% of the total cost of supportive services, including child care, to states, on the basis of the state providing the 25%.

Other than for the few New Jersey centers which receive 25% from the state, all other sponsors and potential sponsors are in competition for the same limited resources from Counties, municipalities, United Ways, and foundations to provide the necessary matching monies.

It should be belaboring the obvious to cite what this obstacle represents to would-be Puerto Rican and Hispanic sponsors.

Limited in numbers, resources and political involvement, for Puerto Ricans and Hispanics, the outcome of this "market system" of developing programs is the present trio of full day programs in the State.

Other Puerto Rican and Hispanic groups have to date been unsuccessful in accounting for the matching funds.

2. *Facilities*

Even in those few instances where matching funds were successfully accounted for, Herculean efforts were required to overcome the series of obstacles on the course toward the opening of a center.

The next problem after money is site. Local groups characteristically engage in weeks, sometimes months, of search and negotiation for a site which can meet State and local licensing standards for child care. Usually, when a site is found and can be secured, substantial renovation and remodeling is required in order to meet licensing requirements. And these requirements must be met before funds—including the limited remodeling funds now available—can be secured!

Thus one center had to raise $12,000 not recapturable from the program in order to meet local and state licensing requirements.

3. *Personnel*

It is reasonable to expect a contribution of time and energy by lay people in order to bring about a needed community service. The level of effort required to organize a center—which means accounting for matching monies, finding and securing a site, writing a proposal, meeting state and local requirements, contracting for renovations, finding qualified staff, establishing criteria for selecting children, purchasing equipment—is beyond the capacity of most general purpose funded programs, not to mention lay groups with no staff.

So, not only is the personnel limited to begin with, but people already involved in community service projects, once they apprehend the multitude of challenges, hassles, and layers of bureaucracy, rationally conclude that "the System" is established to *not* provide child development services.

HEADSTART: IN PLACE, NO CHANGES EXPECTED

Headstart, now administered by the federal Office of Child Development, has expereinced no significant increase in funding since its inception in 1965. Level of funding is expected to remain constant.

TITLE IV–A: OPPORTUNITIES IN NEW JERSEY

New Jersey does have the opportunity to expand child services using Title IVA funds. Its under-usage of this federal program was revealed dramatically in 1972, when Congress ended its then-existing practice of providing funds to states solely on the basis of state provision of 25% of total social services costs, and enacted a funding ceiling and proportionate maximum state entitlements, still contingent upon state provision of the 25% non-federal share.

New Jersey's entitlement was pegged at $88 million; its usage was well under half its entitlement, and was estimated to be approximately $42 million in FY '74.

The New Jersey Division of Youth and Family Services, in recognition of the burgeoned need for child care, requested that the legislature, for FY '75, increase its appropriation for community day care from $1 million to $2.7 million, which they projected would result in an increase in care (including day camps) for 4,000 children and youth, above the 15,000 children and youth affected in FY '74.

The Governor and the Bureau of the Budget recommended instead an increase of $600,000.

As a result of widespread involvement by child advocates around the State, the Legislature restored the full amount requested by DYFS, and stipulated that the state could now provide up to 30% of the required non-federal share of community day care cost.

This action by the legislature is a policy breakthrough in that it recognizes state responsibility to contribute with state monies to child care programs not operated directly by the state.

Even with a breakthrough in state fiscal policy for child care for FY '75, the projected increase in usage of Title IVA funds in FY '75 will still leave a current gap between entitlement and usage of $35 million.

Though competition for these funds among state and local program officers providing a variety of supportive services has already intensified, this existing federal entitlement represents the likeliest possibility for financing increased child development services.

OPPORTUNITY: NEW FUNDS, NEW CONSCIOUSNESS, NEW DELIVERY SYSTEM

A. State of New Jersey—As is recounted above, child development forces in New Jersey experienced in 1974 their first significant breakthrough due to mounting popular concern about child development funding at the state level.

Though the victory was partial, it signifies a qualitative increase in popular awareness about the importance of child development as a policy issue and a receptivity on the part of the State legislature to legitimate demands for state assumption of responsibility for ensuring child care to citizens who want and need it.

Given the manifest gaps in access to care—on the basis of income, public assistance status, geography and ethnicity—and given the still embarrassing underutilization of New Jersey's Title IVA entitlement—it is predictable that sentiment for and activity toward a comprehensive system will continue and escalate.

Furthermore and importantly: the Governor's office was considering a proposal that incorporates the following inseparable elements:

1. That the State assume responsibility for services needed by children and desired by families for children from birth to the age of six, to complement existing state responsibility for providing a "thorough and efficient education" for children of citizens age 6 and above.
2. That all children eligible for child development services under Title IVA receive them.
3. That the State confirms its responsibility to provide the 25% non-federal share under the Social Security Act.
4. That full day child development programs must be costed minimally at a level equivalent to $50/child/week.
5. That state responsibility for funding be distinguished from operation, which must be community-based.

Though a breakthrough of this dimension is not seriously expected at the present time, what is significant is that the Governor's key advisors are willing to discuss the possibility of a financing mechanism for such a program on a basis comparable to current financing proposals for the "Thorough and Efficient Education" mechanism.

B. National Policy:

Important also are developments at the national level. From diverse philosophies, a consensus of legislators is emerging which must result in the next few years in large scale child development legislation.

First, there are the minorities demanding a proportionate share of social programs to continue and reinforce cultural patterns and provide an early childhood experience consistent with community sentiments, to delivery needed social services, feed children, provide corrective and preventive health service.

Second, work patterns have changed so that nationally there are six million mothers of young children in the work force. For the most part, these mothers need to work to provide family income, and cannot afford the high cost of questionable quality child care available privately.

Third, women's consciousness has heightened. A key recognition by middle class women was that a positive child development program would benefit everyone in their family.

Fourth, early childhood and social welfare professionals, with liberal and labor allies advocated public financing of developmental child care as sound social policy.

Fifth, a strategy of fiscal conservativism embraced public support for child care as a condition and a pre-requisite for expanding the labor force, and particularly the supply of low-wage, mostly women workers, and reducing public assistance expenditures.

These categories are not mutually exclusive. This convergence of social and political groupings suggest that substantial additional resources will become available for child care in the foreseeable future.

The stage is set for a conflict between two philosophies of caring for children—emphasis on the child with public support of programs being a right-like fire and police protection—or emphasis on the employment status of the parent, with quality of child care taking second place to immediate cost considerations.

The former position politically congealed within the philosophical framework of the Economic Opportunity Act. But S. 2007, which included this child development Act of 1971, vetoed by the President, emerged with some significant differences from past anti-poverty legislation:

1. The bill was not intended to segregate programs through a restriction of eligibility. Framers of the legislation sought to provide subsidization to middle class, working class, and poor families. Rationale here was for a broadly available program which would develop a broad-based constituency for its expansion. Unlke OEO, the initial expenditure, it was hoped, would be a base for future acceleration instead of a locked-in ceiling.

2. Control of the program would be maintained at the local level by a non-governmental agency, and a new coordinating mechanism, a Child Development Council, would be created. This mechanism *would* relate to the municipal government more directly than do existing Community Action Agencies.

3. The decisive Policy role of parents at the center level was established legislatively.

Prospects are that comprehensive Child Development legislation will receive bipartisan support in the next session of Congress.

Senator MONDALE. We will stand in adjournment to the call of the Chair.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20201

DEC 20 1974

Honorable Walter F. Mondale
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on
Children and Youth
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Mondale:

In connection with recent joint hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Select Subcommittee on Education on S. 3754 and H.R. 15882, the Child and Family Services Act, Subcommittee staff have requested a statement on the Department's current activities on behalf of children.

Pursuant to that request, I am pleased to submit herewith a statement on Current Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Activities on Behalf of Children: A Summary Report for the joint consideration of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Select Subcommittee on Education.

I trust that this will be informative. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me again.

Sincerely,

Caspar W. Weinberger
Secretary

Enclosure

CURRENT DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE ACTIVITIES ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN: A SUMMARY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

I am pleased to present this statement on the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on behalf of children for the joint consideration of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Select Subcommittee on Education. We share a concern in the efforts of the Federal government to protect and enhance the development of our most valuable natural resource--our children. And we both see the challenge in the context of the family as the primary nurturer and developer of the child within the community and society.

Public efforts on behalf of children have a long history in the United States, and have gradually increased over the years to the point now where the Federal government alone spends several billion dollars each year through some two hundred programs designed to benefit young children. Yet massive funding and far-flung programs do not guarantee real impact. There remains serious --- and rightful --- concern in this country that some children still do not experience those positive conditions necessary to assure their full and healthy development.

As a result, we have reached the conclusion that the Department must adopt, to a larger degree than in the past, a more target group oriented perspective in relation to the planning, budgeting and evaluation of our programs.

While its concerns extend to promoting the health and well-being of all groups and classes of people, the Department has, from its inception, recognized its special responsibilities toward particular populations most in need of assistance. Typically these include groups and individuals who, because of poverty, age, disability, unequal opportunity, illness, or other debilitating conditions cannot, unaided, move toward self-sufficiency and independence. On the basis of our experience, it is apparent that the Department's ability to discharge more effectively its responsibilities toward particular populations (in this case, children) could be strengthened through an increased emphasis on the following:

-- greater attention during all phases of agency planning activities (forward planning, operational planning, research and evaluation planning) on identifying and analyzing the principal needs and problems of children;

-- agency assessments of the degree and extent to which current strategies (i.e., current program approaches) are meeting identified children's needs;

-- identification of major gaps in current activities (i.e., important needs and problems which are not being addressed by current programs) and recommendations concerning approaches -- including new legislation, program development, program expansion, etc. -- for addressing unmet needs;

- identification of programs with similar objectives which are operated by separate agencies without sufficient coordination.

Because of my special concern that the programs and policies of my Department achieve a maximum impact on the needs of children, I directed, in December of last year, the Assistant Secretary for Human Development to establish a DHEW Committee on Children. This Committee, under the chairmanship of the Office of Child Development, was charged with conducting an overview of DHEW programs as they relate to children and assessing Departmental policies, legislative programs, and budgetary recommendations as they are formulated. As an initial assignment, the Committee was requested to prepare a statement summarizing the programs and highlighting those aspects which impact on the well-being of children. The information presented in this report is based largely on the findings of the Committee. The report depicts the status of DHEW programs in terms of numbers of children (under 13 years of age) served and dollars expended in FY 74.

But before I turn to these data, I want to comment on the difficulty of the task in which the Committee was involved. Gathering beneficiary and target group specific budget information across the rather wide spectrum of DHEW programs and activities proved to be a significantly more complex task than either I or the Committee anticipated. There are several reasons for this:

1) Data on the extent to which various DHEW programs impact upon children are not currently collected in any standardized manner. Different age breaks are often used by the agencies. It is, therefore, difficult to aggregate program data or to effect comparisons across program lines. Most programs are administered by State or other general purpose governments which have differing information needs and definitions.

2) In some programs, where the impact on children is indirect, and not readily measurable (e.g., as in many research activities), it is not possible to calculate numbers of beneficiaries, although in all probability some children benefit from these activities.

3) Some programs, although focused primarily on children, serve a broader range of beneficiaries. In these cases, the available program data may be over-inclusive, for example, as in the AFDC program which serve children and youth, age 0-21.

4) On the other hand, some programs benefit children although these programs are neither specifically nor primarily targeted on them. In these cases, little information describing specific impacts on children is collected or readily identifiable. One example of this phenomenon is the tuberculosis control activities supported by the Center for Disease Control. Also, many programs serving parents actually have a direct impact on the children, for example, pre-natal care programs.

I view the activities by the Committee, which are reflected in the information which follows, as a first step towards identifying and assessing DHEW efforts on behalf of the more than 49 million children under 13 years of age in this Nation.

We intend to continue our efforts, through the Committee and within individual agencies, to focus on the special problems affecting children and to identify how the Departmental resources may be employed to address specific children's needs. While a number of our programs are directed toward the high-risk, vulnerable child, many also have direct and indirect impact on all children.

DHEW is making a major investment in children. It is estimated that $13.2 billion of our budget either goes directly to children or indirectly aids children.

Following is a summary of the various activities carried out on behalf of children by the Department's agencies -- Health, Education, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Social Security, and Human Development.

ESTIMATED TOTAL HEW BUDGETS AFFECTING CHILDREN
(In millions of dollars)
FY 74

Health	
. Health Services Administration	$ 508.6
. Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Admin.	118.7
. National Institutes of Health	209.4
. Center for Disease Control	25.4
. Food and Drug Administration*	.5
. Health Resources Administration	16.2
Subtotal	878.8
Education	
. Office of Education	3,210.6
. National Institute of Education	26.0
Subtotal	3,236.6
Social and Rehabilitation Service	
. AFDC (Services)	1,500.0
. Child Welfare Services	47.5
. AFDC (Assistance Payments)	3,950.3
. Developmental Disabilities (Basic Support; Model Projects)	9.9
. Medicaid (including EPSDT)	1,200.0
. Research, Demonstrations and Evaluation	1.7
. WIN Child Care	44.5
. SSI-Blind and Disabled (Services)	8.0
. Vocational Rehabilitation (Section 2, SSDI, SSI)	189.6
Subtotal	6,951.5
Social Security Administration	
. Old-Age Survivors and Disability Insurance Benefits	1,723.0
. Medicare (Hospital and Supplementary Medical Insurance) Benefits	6.0
. Supplemental Security Income Program Benefits	10.0
. Black Lung Benefits Program Benefits	18.0
Subtotal	1,757.0
Office of Human Development	
. Head Start	392.1
. Research and Demonstration	15.2
. Child Abuse and Neglect**	0.0
Subtotal	407.3
TOTAL	$13,231.2

* With few exceptions, those portions of the FDA budget which directly affect children cannot be estimated because FDA programs are largely regulatory in nature and intended to benefit all consumers.

** $4.5 million were appropriated late in FY 74 for activities authorized under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (P.L. 93-247). These monies will be obligated in FY 75 in accordance with the provisions of the FY 1974 Second Supplemental Appropriation which extends the availability of these funds through 12/31/74.

HEALTH PROGRAMS AFFECTING CHILDREN

Public Health Services programs affecting children are coordinated by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and are administered by the six member agencies. The Health Services Administration, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration and the Center for Disease Control, to a varying extent, provide direct services to children. However, the activities of the other Health agencies, are for the most part, related to research, personnel training, technical assistance consultation, and regulation, and therefore indirectly impact on children.

Public Health Services programs serving children are administered by the following agencies:

- Health Services Administration (HSA)
- Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA)
- National Institutes of Health (NIH)
- Center for Disease Control (CDC)
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
- Health Resources Administration (HRA)

We estimate that in FY 74 these agencies expended nearly $879 million and served, either directly or indirectly, over 24 million children.

Agency Mission, Beneficiaries and Budgets

HSA. The mission of the Health Services Administration, consisting of the Bureau of Community Health Services, the Indian Health Services, the Bureau of Medical Services, and the Bureau of Quality Assurance, is to provide or ensure the provision of health services to all people in the United States, and specific sub-populations including children, who do not otherwise receive adequate health services.

In FY 74 millions of children were affected by HSA programs, including over 11 million children who were served specifically through various programs in the area of Maternal and Child Health. These numbers include children who may have received services from more than one service program.

In FY 74, the total HSA budget commitment to programs and activities affecting children was $508.643 million, allocated among the major programs, as described in the table below:

ESTIMATED FY 74 HSA BUDGETS AFFECTING CHILDREN
(in millions of dollars)

Patient Care and Special Health Services	$ 12.066
Community Health Centers	114.146
Maternal and Child Health	265.868
Family Planning	14.754
National Health Service Corps	4.039
Indian Health Service	97.770
HSA Total	$508.643

As reflected in the beneficiary and budget data, programs and activities in the area of maternal and child health represent the major thrust of HSA efforts on behalf of children. These activities include:

- provision of grants to states for maternal and child health services
- support of crippled children's programs
- support of research on improving services delivery
- support of training of staff and paraprofessionals to work with the mentally retarded and multiply-handicapped.

The basic purposes of maternal and child health and crippled children's programs are to reduce infant mortality and otherwise promote the health of mothers and children, especially in rural and economically depressed areas, and to locate, diagnose, treat, and provide follow-up care for children suffering from crippling or handicapping illnesses.

Some of the more significant services being provided through the maternal and child health formula and project grant programs include: maternity and infant care, intensive care for high-risk infants, comprehensive health care for children and youth, dental care for children, and comprehensive family planning services.

Grants to States for crippled children's programs are used to locate handicapped children and to provide essential physician and inpatient hospital services and continuing care by various professional personnel. The estimated 500,000 children served have conditions such as orthopedic handicaps, epilepsy, hearing impairment, cerebral palsy, cystic fibrosis, heart disease, and other congenital defects.

Current research in maternal and child health is aimed primarily at improving efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery mechanisms. In addition, there are specific projects to design and develop new prosthetic devices for child amputees and develop methods of treating infants born to drug-addicted mothers.

Much of the training funds in maternal and child health are used to support twenty university-affiliated centers which provide specialized clinical training to physicians and other maternal and child health personnel who work with mentally retarded and multiply-handicapped children. In addition, in 1974, funds for training midwives, pediatric nurses, and other physicians' assistants were provided to fifteen institutions.

ADAMHA. The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) within ADAMHA administers research and training activities and provides direct services for improving mental health of various sub-populations, including a specific priority on child mental health. The National Institute of Mental Health also serves children indirectly through research activities in the area of children's social and emotional needs, through the training of child mental health workers, and through the provision of technical assistance and consultation.

The total budget commitment of ADAMHA for programs affecting children was $118.7 million in FY 74. Of this, $67.684 million was expended by the

National Institute of Mental Health for mental health care, services, and research in the following areas:

- child abuse and neglect
- child mental health and schools
- studies in emotional health and competence
- studies in aggressive or hostile behavior
- influences of television
- community-based treatment models for delinquents and other crime and delinquency activities.

The composite budget estimate of dollars committed to ADAMHA programs affecting children also includes $1.0 million from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) and $50.0 million from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). These agencies provide direct services, to a limited extent, to older children and support a number of training, prevention and treatment projects which benefit younger children as well.

NIH. The mission of the National Institutes of Health is to support research which will expand the knowledge of, and enhance its application to, the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of disease in all people in the United States, including children. Thus, the general orientation of most NIH programs is development and application of knowledge rather than provision of services.

National Institute of Mental Health for mental health care, services, and research in the following areas:

- child abuse and neglect
- child mental health and schools
- studies in emotional health and competence
- studies in aggressive or hostile behavior
- influences of television
- community-based treatment models for delinquents and other crime and delinquency activities.

The composite budget estimate of dollars committed to ADAMHA programs affecting children also includes $1.0 million from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) and $50.0 million from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). These agencies provide direct services, to a limited extent, to older children and support a number of training, prevention and treatment projects which benefit younger children as well.

NIH. The mission of the National Institutes of Health is to support research which will expand the knowledge of, and enhance its application to, the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of disease in all people in the United States, including children. Thus, the general orientation of most NIH programs is development and application of knowledge rather than provision of services.

Within NIH, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which undertakes child-related health research in such areas as perinatal biology and infant mortality, growth and development, and mental retardation, serves as a principal focus within DHEW for basic and applied research bearing specifically on the health and growth of children.

The National Institutes of Health indirectly benefit all of the more than 49 million children, during intra-uterine development and from birth through age 12. The research activities provide services directly only to the small number of children who participate in them. However, some NICHD research activities are targeted on specific groups of children, such as the 60,000 children who die before their first birthday, the 200,000 children who are identified each year as having birth defects, and approximately 1,000,000 mentally retarded children 0-12 years of age.

In FY 74 the budget commitment for NIH programs affecting children totalled $209.442 million. Of this, $60.342 million represents expenditures by the NICHD for biomedical and behavioral research, perinatal and infant mortality research and research on the biological, medical, behavioral and social aspects of mental retardation. FY 74 budget expenditures for child health, broken out by the Institutes which support activities affecting children, are summarized in the table that follows.

ESTIMATED FY 74 NIH BUDGETS AFFECTING CHILDREN
(in millions of dollars)

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	$ 60.342
Division of Research Resources	10.900
National Heart and Lung Institute	32.100
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	29.300
National Institute of Arthritism, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases	6.800
National Institute of Dental Research	28.900
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke	31.400
National Eye Institute	9.700
NIH Total	$209.442*

CDC. The Center for Disease Control administers two health programs oriented toward prevention and treatment of diseases affecting children: the Immunization Project Grant Program and the Childhood Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Program. In addition, a substantial number of children receive screening, diagnostic and treatment services through tuberculosis control activities funded under Section 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act.

Altogether about 12 million children under 13 years of age were served by these programs in FY 74.

---

*Other Institutes, such as the National Cancer Institute, support health and biomedical research programs which benefit children indirectly. However, budget estimates for that portion of research which affects children specifically is not readily identifiable and is therefore not included in this table.

The budget expenditures of the Immunization Program and Lead Based Paint Poisoning Program totalled $25.378 million in FY 74. The amount of funds allocated to TB control activities specifically affecting children cannot, however, be identified and is therefore not included in the composite budget commitment of the Center for Disease Control.

FDA. In addition to its regulatory function, the Food and Drug Administration provides consumers with the appropriate health and safety information necessary for making informed decisions about those products regulated by FDA.

FDA indirectly affects all children in the United States through its information dissemination and regulatory responsibilities which include, among other concerns, the safety and quality of food, the safety and effectiveness of drugs and therapeutic devices, and the safety of radiological products and procedures.

Since the FDA is a regulatory agency whose activities indirectly affect the population at large, only limited and incomplete data are available on budget expenditures for specific sub-populations. What data exist, however, show that a minimum of $500,000 was allocated in FY 74 to new drug activities and poison control activities for children.

HRA. The overall mission of the Health Resources Administration is to provide leadership regarding the identification, deployment and utilization of personnel, educational, physical, financial, and organizational resources in achieving optimal health services for all people of the United States, including children.

Within HRA, the Divisions of Dentistry and Regional Medical Programs and the Bureau of Health Resources Development support demonstration projects which deliver services to children. However, the delivery of health services to children is, for the most part, incidental to research, training, or demonstration. A number of children do receive services through the activities which are not focused on service delivery, for example, research to improve the quality of the delivery of health services, training of health care manpower, and support for the construction and renovation of medical facilities serving children.

While all children are served indirectly by HRA programs, the number of children under 13 years of age to whom services were provided directly, is estimated at 53,000 for FY 74.

The FY 74 budget commitment of HRA for programs affecting children was approximately $16.2 million.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS AFFECTING CHILDREN

Educational activities in DHEW are conducted primarily by two organizations:

- The Office of Education (OE)
- The National Institute of Education (NIE)

Agency Mission, Beneficiaries, and Budgets

OE. The Office of Education provides funds to school systems and other organizations for general educational support, educational support to specific target groups (e.g., handicapped), and support to meet special educational needs or problems (e.g., emergency school aid). The principal programs affecting children under 13 years of age include: Elementary and Secondary Education programs, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Indian Education programs, Emergency School Aid, Education for the Handicapped programs, Vocational, Technical, and Career Education, and Library Resources programs.

It is estimated that, in FY 74, programs administered by the Office of Education affected approximately 37,000,000 school age children attending public and non-public schools. The budget commitment for programs relating to children for FY 74 was $3.2 billion.

Within the OE there are two focal points for programs and activities serving children: Education for the Handicapped and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In FY 74, the Office of Education, through activities supported by the Education for the Handicapped Program, spent approximately $147.0 million for handicapped children 3-21 years of age. An additional $100.0 million was spent on other OE programs affecting handicapped children. These program activities, primarily supported by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, include:

- support to educational programs for more than 2,000 deaf and blind children who were victims of the 1964-65 rubella epidemic
- provision of diagnostic, placement and education services to 40,000 handicapped children through six Regional Resource Centers
- training of approximately 40,000 persons (teachers and other professionals) who will eventually assume positions as workers with the handicapped
- development of model preschool programs for handicapped children
- support for Instructional Material Centers which disseminate materials for handicapped children
- development of media services, films, and special programs for children with specific learning disabilities.

The primary emphasis of OE efforts on behalf of handicapped children has been to build the capacity of State and local agencies to provide appropriate education services. The Education of the Handicapped Act (Part B) provides specifically for aid to States for the initiation, expansion and improvement of special education and related services to handicapped children. In FY 74 it is estimated that 225,000 children received direct services and 2.1 million children received incidental services from programs funded by this Part of the Act.

The second focal point for Federal efforts on behalf of children is Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest Federal aid to education program. It provides funds by State formula grants to supplement State and local expenditures in local educational agencies with large numbers of children from low-income families. The program is intended to help those agencies expand and improve their educational programs to meet the special educational needs of educationally-deprived children. It is further intended to concentrate services, such as tutoring and special counseling, and teaching materials, on the most educationally-deprived children. In fiscal year 1974 Title I provided $1.719 billion to serve approximately 6 million children in prekindergarten through grade 12 in almost 14,000 school districts.

Soon after Title I became law it was amended to include special categories of eligible children including handicapped children living in State-operated institutions. During 1974, State agencies responsible for these children received $85,777,779 and 166,000 handicapped children were served. Title I provided $78,331,000 for services to 380,000 children of migrant agricultural workers and $16,688,398 for approximately 22,000 Indian children served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. An amount of $25,448,869 was made available during fiscal year 1974 to State agencies responsible for education of institutionalized, neglected, and delinquent children; approximately 50,000 children participated.

Large portions of Title I money are allocated for salaries for extra teachers and teacher aides, in-service training for Title I personnel, and special incentive grants to States. In addition, a portion of the funds are used for supportive services.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title III, has spurred innovative and exemplary programs in the field of education. Drug education, environmental education, and preschool education mark some of the new directions in learning supported by Title III. Congress earmarked $146 million for innovative programs in FY 74.

Recognizing that elementary and secondary schools throughout the country are in special need of strengthened library resources. Title II, ESEA, authorizes Federal support to provide textbooks and other books and instructional materials for school libraries. In FY 74 Congress appropriated $90 million for this purpose.

In 1972, Congress recognized the unique learning problems faced by Indian children in passing the Indian Education Act. Under its auspices, funds are given to local school districts, schools administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and directly to various Indian groups such as tribal councils to develop programs specially attuned to the needs and situations of Indian children, including health and nutritional services and bilingual education. An appropriation of $40 million was approved by the legislature for FY 74.

The Economic Opportunity Act established the program Follow Through, aimed at extending into primary grades the educational gains made by deprived children in Head Start. In FY 74, Congress appropriated $41 million to aid children under the Follow Through Program, in a variety of models emphasizing different approaches from behavior modification to parental involvement.

Through its support of the Children's Television Workshop, which produces the television shows Sesame Street and Electric Company, the Office of Education reaches over six million children daily, teaching them the fundamentals of reading and counting, with a warm, appealing format.

Under the Education Professions Development Act, two distinct programs support the training of teachers for young children and the training of educational personnel to serve urban and rural poverty areas. One aim of these programs is to introduce change in the way teachers are trained and utilized to make them more responsive to the particular needs of children of diverse and unique backgrounds.

Through Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Emergency School Aid Act, OE has helped children in schools that are desegregating. This help has included teacher aides, compensatory reading and math programs, multi-ethnic T.V. shows, interracial parent and student councils, and in-service teacher training. Approximately $260 million was expended for these activities in 1974.

Title VII of ESEA provided $50 million in FY 74 for bilingual education programs specially designed to meet the needs of children whose first language is not English. This provision also designates funds for use by institutions of higher education to train teachers in the methods of bilingual education.

Reflecting a current belief that knowledge of the fundamental skills of reading and writing is a prerequisite for educational advancement and recognizing that a significant proportion of pupils are promoted from one grade to the next without having mastered reading skills, Congress instituted the Right to Read Program. Right to Read provides funds for comprehensive reading programs and institutes special intensive programs for children who are behind their grade level in reading. Pre-service training programs are aimed at improving teachers' abilities to teach their students to read.

NIE. The National Institute of Education supports a wide variety of research and demonstration projects in the field of education in order to improve the quality of education of all children.

While some of these projects serve a specified number of children, the impact of the projects extends beyond the immediate beneficiaries of project services.

Approximately 41% of NIE's FY 74 program funds, or $26.0 million, was expended on research to meet the educational needs of children up to 13 years of age.

In FY 74, NIE supported research and demonstration in five priority areas:

1) improving the productivity of resources in education
2) improving the relationship of education to work and careers
3) improving the capability of State and local education systems to solve education problems
4) increasing diversity in American education
5) providing essential skills to all individuals with special emphasis on reading.

These priority areas are oriented around specific problems in American education which may cut across age groups. Two examples of projects which were funded in response to these priority areas are:

- A study of the sentence structures to which elementary school children are exposed in the course of their studies, and the relationship of these structures to the development of reading skills

- A study to examine the development of self-expectations in children, ages 5-11, and how this development is influenced by parents, teachers and peers.

The Office of Research within NIE supports the largest number of child-focused programs. Through these programs, research is concentrated on meeting the educational needs of bilingual and handicapped children, improving children's reading and mathematical competencies and improving the effectiveness of compensatory education.

Three project examples are:

- The Individually Guided Education Program at the Wisconsin Research and Development Center which has developed and is now implementing a new way to organize elementary schools so that teachers can give more attention to the problems of individual children and also have more flexibility in planning programs

- The Program on Teaching and Linguistic Pluralism, at the Stanford Center for Research and Development, which will develop improved tests to assess bilingual (English-Spanish) or bidialectal (standard - non-standard English) language competence. It is also expected that this effort will improve teachers' attitudes toward, and understanding of, non-standard variations of speech.

- A Study of Hyperactivity which may add to our understanding of what causes hyperactivity in an estimated 5 million children in the United States. This study, conducted by the Human Resources Institute in Boston, will test the hypothesis that artificial flavoring and coloring found in foods may be a direct cause of hyperactive behavior as characterized by constant disorganized activity, short attention span, and unusually aggressive conduct.

The Office of Programs within NIE also directs many of its research and development activities toward improving the education of children. These activities include:

- The Alum Rock Educational Voucher Program designed to determine whether elementary schools will become more responsive to parents' concerns when parents have the power to decide which schools and which educational programs will receive financial support

- The Experimental Schools Project aimed at developing instructional programs that are responsive to the needs and desires of individual students and that involve all segments of the community in the planning of these programs

- Awarding of grants to six local school systems to enable them to plan a career education program for grades K-12 and to implement appropriate strategies

- The Marketable Preschool Education Program which provides early education to rural Appalachian children, ages 3 to 5, through a television series supplemented by a home visitor and a mobile classroom unit. This series incorporates elements of the Appalachian culture and emphasizes the development of social skills.

- The District of Columbia Public Schools Response to Educational Needs Project, an inner-city educational program, aimed at increasing the educational achievement levels of approximately 21,000 disadvantaged children in 19 elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in the Anacostia section of Washington, D.C.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMS AFFECTING CHILDREN

Social and rehabilitation programs are administered within DHEW primarily by the Social and Rehabilitation Service (SRS).

Agency Mission, Beneficiaries and Budgets

The Social and Rehabilitation Service administers programs which provide support to States, local communities, organizations and individuals which, in turn, provide a variety of services (social, rehabilitation, income maintenance, medical, family and child welfare, and other necessary services) to the aged, blind, disabled, children and youth and families in need.

The number of children under 13 years of age served by SRS programs can be only roughly estimated since many programs affect target groups which are defined more broadly or differently, and which typically encompass youth and may often encompass entire families, as well. However, in FY 74, it is estimated that more than 20 million children and youth, age 0 to 21 years, were served directly by SRS programs.

Budget commitments for children under SRS programs in FY 74 totalled $6,951.5 million. The table on the following page lists budget expenditures for individual SRS programs affecting children.

Every program in the Social and Rehabilitation Service has resources allocated to the support and development of children. The major Federal income maintenance program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, provides an average matching rate of 54% for State benefit payments to AFDC families. In January 1974, 10.86 million persons, of whom 7.8 million were children, received an average payment of $58 per person.

ESTIMATED FY 74 SRS BUDGETS AFFECTING CHILDREN (0-21 YEARS)

(in millions of dollars)

AFDC (Assistance Payments)	$ 3,950.3*
Medicaid	1,200.0
AFDC (Services)	1,500.0*
SSI-Blind and Disabled (Services)	8.0
Child Welfare Services	47.5
WIN Child Care	44.5
Vocational Rehabilitation (Section 2, SSDI, SSI)	189.6
Developmental Disabilities	
Basic Support	9.0
Model Projects	0.9
Research, Demonstrations and Evaluation	1.7
	$ 6,951.5

---

*With the exception of these budget items all others are limited to estimated dollars to be spent on children, not families.

An even greater number of children are eligible to receive Medicaid services. These include the AFDC children, children in medically needy families in 27 States and children in working poor families in 17 States where total family income is below the State's assistance standard. In FY 74 it is estimated that 12.1 million children received Medicaid services which included early and periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment (EPSDT). According to 1972 figures, of those children receiving Medicaid services, about 70% received physicians' services, 15% received dental services, and 10% received hospital inpatient services. The Medicaid Program, including EPSDT, contains several important provisions specifically for child health. Certain types of care are mandated for children regardless of State Plan specifications for other eligibles.. Among these are dental, hearing and vision. The Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program emphasizes preventive medicine and attempts to bring all eligible children into the health care system. In FY 74, it is estimated that about 1.6 million children were screened for physical and mental defects, about 45% of whom were referred for diagnosis and treatment. This shift in emphasis towards preventive services for children also will be reflected in program plans for increasing the number of recipients enrolled in Health Maintenance Organizations.

Another primary source of funds for children's needs are the public social services programs administered by SRS-CSA under Titles IV-A, IV-B and VI of the Social Security Act. These titles provide Federal funds to States for 75% of the cost of social services furnished to recipients of financial assistance, and, at State option, to persons identified as former or potential recipients. Title IV-A (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) mandates, as a condition for receiving Federal funds for the AFDC program, that States provide to current recipients, as a minimum, family planning services, foster care services, child care services, and protective services for abused and neglected children. The law also authorizes additional services to maintain and strengthen family life and to help families attain or retain capability for maximum self-support and personal independence.

Title IV-B of the Social Security Act authorizes the provision of Federal funds to enable cooperation with States in establishing, extending and strengthening child welfare services. Such services are directed toward the prevention and remedy of problems of vulnerable children in the areas of neglect, abuse, exploitation, delinquency, abandonment, physical and mental handicaps, illegitimacy, and emotional and social adjustment. The focus of these services is to insure the care and protection of children in their own homes, or when necessary, the provision of adequate care away from their homes. Thus, child welfare services are intended either to supplement or to substitute for parental care and supervision.

Title VI of the Act (Services to the Aged, Blind, or Disabled) authorizes Federal funds for social services to assist current, former or potential recipients of Supplemental Security Income benefits to attain or retain capability for self-support and self-care. Since children under the age of 18, or under the age of 22 if in school, may now qualify for Supplementary Security Income benefits, handicapped or blind children may now receive services provided by States under Title VI. Because this program is new, the exact number of children to be provided services is not yet known. As of July 31, 1974, there were almost 65,000 child applicants for Supplementary Security Income benefits who also would be eligible for services under Title VI as current recipients of assistance.

Under all of these programs, the kinds of services provided directly to children include: child care services including day care, foster care services, protective services, health-related services, family planning services to assist children in obtaining education in accordance with their capacities, and services to mentally retarded children. For example, $594 million dollars was expended in FY 74 for employment-related and other types of day care. This day care was provided through Social Services, WIN, and assistance payment disregards. It accounts for over 25% of the total Federal obligations for day care ($2.1 billion). In the area of foster care it is estimated that Federal expenditures exceeded $280 million.

Complementing the social services programs are the comprehensive services provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Program. State VR agencies have cooperative agreements with school departments in many States to provide early and timely rehabilitation services to handicapped children. The program served over 350,000 youths in FY 74 and rehabilitated 99,868 of those served. Children and youth also enter the VR services system based on their SSI and OASDI eligibility for which budgeted and trust funds are allocated for rehabilitation services.

Greatly contributing to serving the needs of handicapped children are program funds allocated to children under the Developmental Disabilities Act. This relatively new program spends about half of its flexible service funds on the 0-21 year old population group. In addition, from a small set-aside for projects of national significance, approximately $300,000 was pooled with monies from OE and NIMH to fund model child advocacy projects, three of which deal directly with handicapped children.

Other model projects have been funded under a program named CAIR (Community Alternatives and Institutional Reform). Seven of the 14 model programs deal primarily with children, at a cost of $572,300.

SRS allocates about $1.7 million of its research, demonstration and evaluation money to child-related problems and concerns. These projects include the development of methods for early detection of child abuse, collection of data on runaways, and evaluation of foster care programs.

SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AFFECTING CHILDREN

Social security programs are administered within DHEW primarily by the Social Security Administration (SSA).

Agency Mission, Beneficiaries and Budget

SSA. The Social Security Administration is responsible for administering the social security cash benefits program (old-age, survivors', and disability insurance), the Medicare Program, the Supplemental Security Income Program, and part of the Black Lung Benefits Program.

The estimated average number of beneficiaries under 13 years of age served monthly during FY 74 by old-age, survivors' and disability insurance was 1.641 million; by Medicare, less than 500; by the Supplemental Security Income Program, about 15,000; and by the Black Lung Benefits Program, 21,000. The total number of children affected by all SSA programs is estimated at 1.677 million.

The total budget commitment for SSA program benefits affecting children under 13 years of age for FY 74 was $1,757.0 million, $1,723.0 million of which was accounted for by old-age, survivors' and disability insurance.

Children eligible for cash benefits under the old-age, survivors', and disability insurance program are children of a retired or disabled worker who is entitled to benefits, or children of a deceased worker who was insured at the time of death. The average monthly benefit to children of retired workers in December 1973 was approximately $61; for children of disabled workers, $50; for children of deceased workers, $112.

As of July 1, 1973, Medicare coverage was extended to individuals under the age of 65 who are currently or fully insured or entitled to monthly social security benefits, and to the spouses and dependent children of such individuals, who require hemodialysis or renal transplantation for chronic renal disease.

The Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Program is an income-tested cash assistance program administered by the Social Security Administration. On January 1, 1974, SSI replaced the "adult category" programs (Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to The Permanently and Totally Disabled) in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Under the previous Aid to Permanently and Totally Disabled Program, children under 18 years of age were excluded from receiving assistance; under the program for Aid to the Blind, nearly one-half of the States excluded children under 16 years of age. The SSI Program provides a major change in policy for children in that it now includes individuals who are medically determined to be blind or disabled without regard to age. To be eligible for SSI an individual must have income and resources below the amount specified in the law. After certain exclusions are applied to an individual's income, the standard benefit rate of $146 a month for an individual (adult or child) is reduced by the remaining income to determine the amount of the monthly benefit. In the case of a child under 21 years of age, resources and income of a parent or spouse of a parent, under certain conditions, are deemed to be the child's for purposes of determining the child's eligibility and, if he or she is eligible, the amount of his or her benefit. Additional cash benefit amounts may be available through State supplements to the basic Federal benefit. In addition to the cash benefit, by virtue of SSI eligibility the child is referred for services provided under Title VI of the Social Security Act and may be eligible for Medicaid.

Children (under age 18) of disabled coal miners, or coal miners who died as a result of pneumoconiosis, are eligible to receive benefits under the Black Lung Benefits Program. The basic program benefit is set at 50 percent of the minimum monthly benefit payable to a totally disabled Federal employee in Grade GS-2 under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act. If there is only one orphan child of the deceased miner, the benefit to the child is the same as the basic benefit to a miner. If the miner has only one dependent child or a widow has only one child, the basic benefit is increased by 50 percent; by 75 percent if there are two children; and by 100 percent if there are three children.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AFFECTING CHILDREN

Within the Office of Human Development, DHEW, programs related to early childhood development are administered primarily by the Office of Child Development (OCD).

Agency Mission, Beneficiaries and Budget

The Office of Child Development serves as an advisor to the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Human Development, and other Federal agencies on matters pertaining to the care and development of children. The agency assists in the development of national policies and programs which have a significant impact on the well-being of children and their families. The Office develops information on problems and trends affecting child life; analyzes information on programs serving children; recommends and reviews legislative proposals in the area of early childhood and child welfare generally; and provides leadership in the development of priorities and strategies for childhood research, demonstration, and experimental efforts.

Major programmatic activities conducted by the OCD are focused on meeting the developmental needs of preschool age children from low-income families and on improving services to particular populations of vulnerable children such as the abused or neglected, children in foster care, children in need of adoptive homes, and children in institutions. In the area of day care, the Office provides technical assistance, conducts research, and develops standards applicable to Federally funded programs.

Major programs administered by the Office of Child Development during FY 74 were Project Head Start and the Research and Demonstration Program. During FY 74 Project Head Start served approximately 379,000 children, about 15% of the child population whose family incomes would qualify them for the program. Of the 379,000 children enrolled approximately 38,000 (10.1%) were handicapped.

The total FY 74 budget commitment to OCD programs was $407.3 million. Of this $392.1 million was allocated for Project Head Start, and $15.2 million for research and demonstration activities (including $1.4 million for child abuse projects).

Head Start is a comprehensive preschool program which serves disadvantaged children and their families. It encompasses a wide range of developmental activities (e.g. health, nutrition and education) which are provided through full year and summer programs. The program places a heavy emphasis on parental involvement and on working with families of enrolled children.

Head Start is viewed as a large scale demonstration of ways in which to design and deliver services intended to promote the health and general well-being of children.

Among the innovative programs undertaken through Project Head Start are the following:

- The Child and Family Resources Program, a demonstration program which broadens Head Start's focus from the preschool child to the entire family and gives special attention to children from the prenatal stage of development through the early school years (0-8 years of age). The CFRP approach is to use a Head Start program as the nucleus of a services-delivery network working closely with other community agencies to make available an appropriate range of services for each enrolled family.

. Head Start Services for Handicapped Children, an experimental program designed to demonstrate a number of approaches to providing services to handicapped children in an integrated setting with non-handicapped children. The projects stress development and testing of alternative approaches to the more effective delivery of services to handicapped children and their parents.

. Head Start Collaboration with the Medicaid Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program, an experimental program involving approximately 200 Head Start projects, has assisted in making Medicaid EPSDT services available to Head Start children who are potentially eligible for Title XIX and to other selected Medicaid-eligible children 0-6 years old.

. Home Start, a demonstration program designed to explore the feasibility of a home-based child development program. The specific goals of the program are to enhance parents' capabilities for education and development of their own children; demonstrate alternatives to center-based comprehensive child development programs; and to gather information on what constitutes successful home-based programs for dissemination to other child development service providers.

In FY 74, OCD's Research and Demonstration Program supported projects in a variety of areas of concern, including: 24-hour comprehensive emergency service programs for children; parent education programs for youth; model adoption subsidy law and guidelines and foster family services guidelines for States; approaches to increasing the rate of adoption of handicapped children; deinstitutionalization of children; consumer preferences for day care and cost and quality factors in day care programs; and research studies related to various aspects of child development and the family.

In addition, the Office of Child Development, in collaboration with several other DHEW agencies, spearheaded a coordinated intradepartmental effort aimed at improving the reporting, detection, treatment, and prevention of child abuse and neglect. A variety of different projects were undertaken by participating agencies through the reprogramming of approximately $4 million in discretionary resources. It is estimated that 100 to 200 thousand children will benefit, both directly and indirectly, as a result of the broad range of projects addressing this problem.

CONCLUSION

This overview of the Department's activities affecting children is based, as I indicated previously, on the report of the recently formed DHEW Committee on Children. The report is essentially a first step toward identifying and assessing our efforts on behalf of the more than 49 million children in this Nation. Further, I look to the Committee to serve as a vehicle for the coordination and assessment of child-related activities of the Department on a continuing basis. And I expect the Committee to undertake a number of special studies focused on particular problems affecting children and to recommend means by which the Department's resources may be deployed to address specific children's needs.

In closing, I would like to summarize briefly by saying that the Department's efforts on behalf of children are many and varied, so much so that comparison and coordination are sometimes difficult. And while considerable resources have been and are being expended, and many children receive services, we are acutely sensitive to the need for continual examination and assessment of our activities to assure that, within the scope of Federal responsibilities, our resources are used most effectively to provide the children of our Nation with the services they need. We look forward to working with the Congress to assure that our efforts truly protect and enhance the development of children throughout the Nation.

Implementing Child Development Programs

Report of an August 1974 National Symposium

A report of

The Education Commission of the States

December 1974
Report No. 58
Early Childhood Report No. 10

Task Force Members

Milton Akers
Washington, D.C.

Hannah Atkins
Oklahoma State Representative

Robert W. Blanchard
Superintendent of Schools
Portland, Oregon

Nikki Blankenship
Early Childhood Bilingual Program
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory
Austin, Texas

Howard Bray
Academy for Contemporary Problems
Washington, D.C.

Preston Bruce
Office of Child Development, H.E.W.
Washington, D.C.

Benjamin Carmichael
Commissioner of Education
Tennessee

Barbara Finberg
Executive Associate
Carnegie Corporation of New York

D. Robert Graham
Florida State Senator

Dorothy Gregg
Director of Public Relations
Celanese Corporation
New York, New York

Beverly Gunst
Vice President, Nursery School
Association for Childhood
Education International

Orval Hansen
U.S. House of Representatives
Idaho

John Himelrick
Director
West Virginia Interagency Council
for Child Development Services

Hubert Humphrey III
Minnesota State Senator

Edwin Martin
Acting Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Education for the
Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education, H.E.W.

Robert E. McNair
Governor of South Carolina, 1965-71

Mrs. Ray E. Miller
Chairman
State Advisory Council for
Vocational Education
North Dakota

John H. Niemeyer
President Emeritus
Bank Street College
New York, New York

The Rev. Albert Schneider
Superintendent
Archdiocese of Santa Fe
New Mexico

Howard Schrag
Director
Idaho Institute of Human Development

Marilyn Smith
Executive Director
National Association for the
Education of Young Children

Jule Sugarman
Chief Administrative Officer
Atlanta, Georgia

Daniel B. Taylor
Superintendent of Public Instruction
West Virginia

Jeannette Watson
Director
Texas Office of Early Childhood
Development

Burton White
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Education Commission of the States

Governor David Hall, Oklahoma
ECS Chairman 1974-75

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

Gene Hensley, Interim Director
Elementary/Secondary Education

Tommy Neal, Director
Early Childhood Project

Teresa Salazar, Associate Director
Early Childhood Project

Bonnie Barrett Stretch, Research Associate
Early Childhood Project

Marilyn Tadych, Administrative Assistant
Early Childhood Project

Connie Maslow, Secretary
Early Childhood Project

IMPLEMENTING CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Report of an August 1974 National Symposium

The 10th report of
The Education Commission of the States
Early Childhood Task Force

December 1974

Additional copies of this report may be obtained for $1.00 from the Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203

© 1974 Education Commission of the States

ERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-
IGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Education Commission
of the States
) ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
NDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
ITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRO-
JCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
JIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
VNER

Contents

Introduction 1
Sally V. Allen, Director
ECS Department of Communications

Making Children a Public Issue 5
Mrs. Francis W. Sargent
Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts

Reassessing Our Educational Priorities 8
Burton White
Director, Preschool Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Public Policy and Early Childhood Education:
A Buddhist Garden 19
Edwin W. Martin
Acting Deputy Commissioner, Bureau
of Education for the Handicapped, U.S.
Office of Education

Organizing to Deliver Services:
Alternative Approaches 24
Panel Discussion

Families and Children:
Why Do We Ignore Their Needs? 42
Walter F. Mondale
U.S. Senator, Minnesota

Organizing to Deliver Services:
The Public School System 49
Panel Discussion

Day Care and Cost Effectiveness:
A National Overview and a Case Study 64
Panel Discussion

Making State Policies for Children 80
Dale Bumpers
Governor of Arkansas

Program Participants and Resource Consultants 87

Introduction

Sally V. Allen, Director
ECS Department of Communications

In December 1972, the Education Commission of the States Early Childhood Project held its first meeting on implementing state early childhood programs. Then we were convinced that any action for young children and their families would have to be generated in the states, but at that time there was very little experience to which state policymakers could turn when faced with hard decisions about what to do, how much it would cost and who would help. The situation in 1974 might be characterized by the parable of Michael, an energetic 5-year-old, who fell off the swings while at a child care center playground. A concerned staff member dashed over, swooped him up in her arms and repeated, "Don't cry Michael, don't cry, Michael, everything will be all right." Michael looked up at her, dry-eyed, and said, "Cry, hell; I'm going to sue."

There has been a change. The second symposium of the ECS Early Childhood Project reflected that change. The interval between the two meetings saw a growing national interest in the early childhood years. More importantly, it saw the emergence of a variety of state policies and programs that are worth careful examination by state policymakers across the country.

The ECS Early Childhood Project holds the continuing conviction that the action for children will be and should be centered in the states. Revenue sharing, a growing federal interest in state planning and state capacity to deliver services and the current paralysis of Congress all suggest that state initiatives are essential to early childhood programs. We are, frankly, not optimistic that the Child and Family Services bills recently introduced by U.S. Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota and U.S. Representative John Brademas of Indiana will herald large amounts of new federal money in the foreseeable future. It does appear, however, that Senator Mondale and Representative Brademas are now more seriously interested in the capacity of the states to deliver children's services and that the prime sponsorship section of their bills could be the target of productive debate. In any case, it is clear that no matter what happens to the bills, a state's track record in child development will be increasingly important in future federal funding plans.

This symposium on Implementing Child Development Programs was planned to make it possible for decisionmakers with responsibility for child and family services — in state legislatures, governors' offices and state agencies — to explore at least five fundamental questions.

1. What priorities should a state consider as it sets up or expands child development programs? Drawing on research in early childhood and recent experience by several states in assessing needs and developing statewide plans, the symposium presented a wide range of concerns that states need to examine.

2. What are the most effective mechanisms to get services to children and families who need and want them? The symposium program addressed two sides of this issue. On the one hand, state-level administrative structures have been set up to coordinate children's services, but these, for the most part, bypass state education agencies. On the other hand, the state education department might serve as a service delivery system. Over the last three to four years some 17 state offices of child development or the equivalent have been set up. To a large extent they reflect suspicion and concern that state education departments can't or won't become involved in child development, broadly defined. Does this serve the better interest of children and families, or are overlapping systems being established, when the public schools could do the job? As states and as a nation, we have not faced this issue.

3. What is and what should be the relationship between the states and the federal government in child development? We have argued, of course, that the action should be in the states. At the symposium, Senator Mondale spoke to that issue and Governor Dale Bumpers, on the basis of his Arkansas experience, offered a state point of view. Their remarks are included in this report.

4. What are the costs of various approaches to child and family services? There has been very little useful information for policymakers concerned about allocating scarce resources among the variety of worthy causes. The problem is related, of course, to wide variation in costs among states and regions and to an apparent inability to develop a consensus on definitions and minimum program and staffing requirements. But we have long argued that theoretical research is of little use to policymakers unless researchers are willing to consider costs and cost effectiveness.

5. Once a state decides it wants to get into the child development business, where can it get help? This is still a new business; there is no single source to which states can turn for technical assistance with the variety of new and complicated problems they are facing. How can a needs assessment be carried out? Should a state revise its child abuse legislation? A major purpose of this symposium was to make available the best talent in the country to discuss concretely these technical assistance concerns.

Attending the symposium were nearly 300 persons from 40 states. The roster of participants included many nationally known experts, state and federal policymakers, members of the ECS Early Childhood Task Force and state leaders involved in the everyday problems of program implementation.

They came together to review the issues in implementing state child development programs, to benefit from the activities of the past two years and to begin to establish future priorities. The experience of this symposium — as reflected in both the presentations offered in this report and in the informal and intensive discussions throughout the meeting — indicates that the necessary momentum for implementing child development programs in the states is now well under way.

Making Children a Public Issue

Mrs. Francis W. Sargent
Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts

It is only within the last decade that programs for children have come into the spotlight. Before that, they were merged with all human service programs in one big pot. No one really knew what percentage of the budget they received or whether they received the services mandated by law. The reason children received such second-class status was simple — they couldn't vote, and unlike the elderly they couldn't create an effective lobby. It took surrogates like the people attending this symposium to do that for them. Children's programs in 1974 are looking better, although they have a still longer way to go. But I would like to review with you, for a moment, the progress we have made here in Massachusetts. I'd like to use it as a model for some of the other programs that we will face in the future.

The impetus behind the Massachusetts Office for Children was a 1970 report by Richard Rowe on child care in Massachusetts. It had been preceded by several other research projects, but it summed up contemporary thinking about children's services. In this report, Rowe advocated two basic needs for children in Massachusetts: the need for a central agency for children's programs and the need for education and development of young children.

Before the creation of the Office for Children, there were 13 agencies responsible for programs for children. They were characterized by buck-passing, disorganization and pressure to respond to adult needs first. The Office for Children has really changed all of this. It has not become just another bureaucracy. It has, I am proud to say, remained responsive to children and their parents. It has, through its regional councils, enabled grass-roots people to have a major role in the decision-making process and it has been an effective lobbying force at appropriation time.

The need for the education of young children on a developmental model has had a less successful history. Year after year since the report first came out, legislation has been submitted to the general court proposing a series of different systems. Two things are apparent from the successive failure of this legislation: the cost factor and the need for public education. Let me address both of these problems.

Whether we argue the federal case or the state case on the cost of developmental day care, the cost seems to be in the vicinity of $2,000 per child per year. The federal government computed these costs to apply to every child eligible, in my opinion a somewhat unrealistic assumption. But whichever way you add up the figures, the total cost is very high. So far it is higher than the taxpayer is willing to stand.

The other and, it seems to me, even more important factor is public understanding of the issue. The average taxpayer seldom knows what you mean by "developmental day care" or "home care." This understanding is crucial because, if we do not get the highest quality of care for our children, then there is no question that they are better off at home, no matter what their homes are like.

There has been a trend in this nation to penalize those who do not work and to go to unnecessary lengths to provide work for the unemployed. The proposals of the Nixon Administration for day care were not addressed to the needs of children; they were intended to get mothers off the welfare rolls.

Recently, unemployed construction workers in Trenton, N.J., demonstrated to demand the repeal of the environmental protection act. And here in Massachusetts, we have seen the highway construction lobby fight Mass Transport in the name of jobs.

Somewhere along the way we have gotten our values muddled. This is not an either-or situation. We have to work for good day care *and* the hope that mothers can become part of the job market. We have to work for clean air *and* a healthy construction industry. We have to find another way to move people besides highways and cars *and* still find work for the highway industry. And we may not achieve every social objective at once.

Perhaps the most revolutionary social legislation passed in this commonwealth in the past decade is the Special Education Act, or Chapter 766, which goes into effect in September 1974. This law mandates that every public school in the state must provide for the education of all children with special needs between the ages of 3 and 21.

One thing is sure about Chapter 766: its aims are not going to be accomplished overnight. First of all, every handicapped child, or every child with a special need, is not going to be identified by this September. But what this legislation does is provide the mandate and the right for every child to an education. This alone is a huge step forward. With the lead time that I think we have, I think that our most important immediate task, as administrators and legislators, is to educate the public about their rights — educate the parents, the children who are entering public school for the first time, the children who are already in the public schools, the teachers themselves, and the school and town committees.

The proponents of this legislation were mainly the parents of children with special needs, as well as the professionals in the field. These two groups have formed a coalition that is the best basis for a lobbying group, but they need to expand their activities and not just educate the legislators. They need to educate the broad public, the people who are not only footing the bill but who are very apprehensive about their own children being in school with these handicapped children.

Last fall, I had the privilege of going to Sweden to study retardation programs and I was amazed at the public acceptance of the retardation programs by the people back in the communities. I said, "This couldn't have happened all at once. How did you do it?" The answer was very plain; they said, "We've been at it for 10 years, and the government has spent a lot of money on public education." It never would have sold itself without a lot of help.

When the public fails to understand and accept the premise of social legislation, then history has shown that this same public can modify and repeal progressive legislation. We are already seeing inroads made on civil rights legislation. We may yet see the erosion of the environmental protection act. We cannot presume that the public understands and appreciates special needs. We have to work with them, all the way, bringing them with us. Only then will we have secured the necessary social revolution.

Reassessing Our Educational Priorities

Burton White
Director, Preschool Project
Harvard Graduate School of Education

My purposes are to inform and attempt to influence you about a topic I think is of the highest priority in regard to national educational policy, our national resources and last, but far from least, the solidity of our young families. That topic is the role of the family in the education of a young child, particularly during the first three years of life.

My specialty is the study of what it takes to help each child make the most of whatever potential he brings into the world through the experiences of the first six years of life. That's my special role both as a member of the ECS Early Childhood Task Force and professionally. I believe that our current national educational policy is significantly flawed in this particular problem area, that we're wasting much of our most precious natural resource — the people of the next generation — and that we're allowing the quality of everyday life for many of our young families to be far more stressful and far less rewarding than it could be. An awful lot of our most able young women have a miserable average day with two young children; very few people realize this, and the last ones to know are their husbands.

I've been conducting research on the early educational development of children for about 16 years now. When I say conducting research I don't mean every few weeks for an hour or two; I mean that's *all* I've been doing. Seventy-five per cent of my professional time has been on direct empirical research on this topic. I've come to some central conclusions that cry out for a new look at our national educational policy.

First of all, children start to learn long before they enter our education system. Traditionally, in this country and in every other Western country where there has been any writing on the history of education, the society first puts money into the job when the children get to be about 6 years of age. No society has ever put a lot of money into the first years of life, as far as I can find in the literature. Yet everybody knows that children are learning from the first day they come into the world. Although they don't usually learn to read, write or cipher much before 5 or 6 years of age, they do start, or fail to start, to learn in more fundamental areas that seem to determine directly how well they will later learn to read, write and cipher.

There are at least four fundamental learning topics that all children cope with before their third birthdays. These are not debatable points, by the way. First of all—language development. We have known for years that language growth starts and, in a large way, develops to a solid working capacity before the third birthday. Two- and three-month-old children don't process the meaning of words at all; at 6, 7, 8 months, they begin to understand the meaning of a few selected words — not surprisingly, words like their own name, Mommy, Daddy, kiss, bottle. That initial vocabulary is reasonably well understood, I think. By the time they're 3 years of age, most children have the capacity to understand most of the language they'll use in ordinary conversation for the rest of their lives.

Now language is at the heart of educational capacity. It has its own primary value and, in addition, an instrumental value of direct relevance to all intellectual learnings. Subtly, but just as importantly, it also underlies healthy social growth. Sociability in the first couple years of life depends for its good development on some capacities in the language area, particularly when it comes to other children.

The second major educational foundation that's undergoing development in this first three-year period is curiosity. What could be more important to whether a child learns anything — not just about academic subjects, but about the world at large, about what makes people tick, about how to become a good listener — than simple curiosity. It's the birthright of every child, with a few exceptions — the badly damaged children, for example, may have less of it. But even if a child comes from a bad home and is beaten regularly, it's very difficult to stamp out strong, basic, simple, pure curiosity in the first eight or nine months of life. It is, unfortunately, not that difficult to stamp it out in the next year or two or, if not stamp it out, suppress it dramatically or move it over into peculiar aberrant patterns. Take for example, the 2-year-old who looks at a new toy and, unlike other 2-year-olds, sizes it up mainly to see how he can use it to badger his mother. That's not sheer unqualified curiosity. That can also be very tough on a young mother, by the way.

Third major point — social development. In the last five or six years we've begun to apply a little more serious attention to the value of social goals for our educational system, although we're still limping along in this area. For years we've had soft-hearted early-education people saying a child is more than a brain, but they have seldom been listened to because most of them don't have doctorates and most of them don't have the gift of gab. I personally believe, and have a lot of research evidence to support it, that the social skills that develop in the first preschool years are every bit as important, every bit as instrumental, to the intellectual success of a student, for example, as the directly intellectual skills. Moreover, I think a lot of people in this country would be happier if the children we produced were not only bright but were people with whom they liked to live.

We are pretty clear now on the details of social development; we know that human infants won't survive without some sort of strong, protective attachment to an older, more mature, more capable human. And God or somebody else built into the creature a collection of attributes — tools, actually — that help in the cementing of a relationship to somebody.

For instance, that early social smile of the 3-month-old is not reserved for any particular person. It looks as if the child is using it on everyone who happens by. It's as if the species had a kind of first-stage guarantee of attractiveness. The 3- and 4-month-old child is an incredibly attractive, nice-to-live-with creature. He starts to giggle and becomes ticklish for the first time; he's given to euphoria a great deal. Now that's fun, and the photographers like it a great deal, but I think there's a more serious species-survival virtue to this particular kind of phenomenon.

Then, between 8 months and 24 months or so, there takes place one of the most gorgeous experiences you'll ever see. The child establishes a relationship—usually to the mother, because most of our children are still being brought up in homes by their own families. This is an incredibly complicated relationship, making most contracts pale in simplicity in comparison to it. The child learns thousands of things about what he can and can't do in his home, what he can and can't do in interactions with the primary caretaker, about how to read her different mood states, and an incredible number of other things. After all, little children have relatively little in the way of important obligations other than just enjoying themselves, and one of the few really overpowering interests of the child 8 to 24 months of age is that other key figure.

We have seen children at age 2 who are marvelous people to live with; they are free and easy; they are comfortable with their parents; they have gone by the negativism of the second year pretty well. They can play alone well. They are just a delight. On the other hand, how many times have you heard a mother of a 2-year-old say he doesn't play alone well? That's synonymous for he's hanging onto my skirt or my slacks or my legs all day long. That situation can be very rough, especially if there is another child, 8 months of age, crawling around in the home simultaneously. When we see a child for the first time at 2 years of age, it's too late. They are crystallized into their basic social patterns and we see those social patterns applied to all social encounters in the next year or two — to other children who come into the home, to older siblings, to other adults. A human personality is being formed during those first two years, and there is no job more important than doing that well.

Over and above that primal social development, we have the foundations of intelligence. There are all sorts of problems children can't solve in the first two or three years of life, but they are learning the tools of the trade, and this process is beautifully and brilliantly explained, in detail, in the work of Jean Piaget, the Swiss student of the growth of intelligence. From the very first years, children are very much interested in cause-and-effect relationships, in learning about simple mechanisms such as jack-in-the-boxes and flipping light switches on and off to see the consequences. Such events are trivial little things on the surface, but they indicate a very deep interest in how things work and in the various characteristics of physical objects. After all, these children haven't had a chance to examine many things firsthand, and most things, therefore, are new to them.

Now, these four topic areas are, I submit, the foundations of educational capacity. I'll repeat them: language development, curiosity, social development and the roots of intelligence. They are all undergoing basic formative development in the first three years of life, and the national education system essentially ignores that fact.

These fundamental learnings do not always go well. Indeed, there's reason to believe that failures in these learnings in the first years lead directly to underachievement in the elementary grades and beyond. We're getting there after the horse has left the barn.

Moreover, poor results or failures in the first years are extremely difficult to correct using any means we now have available. I'll repeat that because it's a very strong statement and I think I can support it — poor results or failures in the first three years are extremely difficult to correct using any means now available, be it $10,000 a year spent in a private tutoring situation or a Head Start or a Follow Through or a special education program.

In addition, relatively few of our children, regardless of the type of family that raises them—and that includes your families and mine, your grandchildren and mine—get as much out of the education of the first years as they might. We are probably wasting substantial amounts of our most precious resource, the developed competencies of each new generation.

Can I back up these claims, or am I just another in a long list of education sensationalists?

Point one: Children who enter the first grade significantly behind their peers are not likely ever to catch up. There are exceptions, but the norm is that they fall further behind. This has been recognized educationally for a long time.

Let me tell you a little story about the origination of the Brookline Early Education Project. The superintendent of schools in Brookline, Mass., who's a very smart and vigorous fellow, called me one day and said, "I've been reading things like Benjamin Bloom's statement that most of intelligence is already developed by the time the child is 8, and that half of it is in by 4. I put that idea together with the experience we have in our school system [where, by the way, next year they have budgeted $2,490 for each child at the high school level and $1,900 for the elementary level]. I think I have a pretty good school system," he went on. "But I know that when I get a child in the first grade who already looks weak, I can't do much for him, even though I have one of the best special ed programs in the country."

Now as a reasonable man, he is driven to consideration of the topic of prevention. He has no choice. In fact, it's the same reasoning that led to the creation of Head Start. But here is a fellow who has no excuses — he has first-rate people, he has more money than God and he still cannot do the job.

He said, "I want to recommend that all kids get into our schools at age 4. What do you think of that as a good way to get into this problem?" I said, "That's a dumb idea." He said, "What do you mean? People have been telling me that public kindergarten is a great thing for all these years." I said, "Look, don't spend all your money on an expensive kindergarten program. Half or more of your kids are not going to get much out of it educationally, in my opinion. Take a look at what is going on in the first six years, not just in the fifth year. Try to get at the origin of educational deficits; try to prevent them. Try to help earlier in the game." And so we built the Brookline program. (For a more detailed discussion of the Brookline program, see pages 59 to 63.)

Second point: The country has been working on prevention for nine years now in a very substantial way. Head Start's original central purpose, I remind you, was to prevent educational failure. Now, it has had lots of other purposes that have grown in emphasis in the last four or five years—better early health care, better social and emotional development. But don't you forget that the original rhetoric that sold Head Start was to try to prevent educational failure. That has been its core purpose. It has had a budget, most of you know, of several hundred million dollars a year for these nine years, and it's been politically powerful. It has concentrated on the 3- to 5-year age period.

There are two conclusions I think can be easily drawn from the Head Start experience (so far) that are appropriate to this discussion: First, it doesn't often succeed in its prime goal (no matter what somebody working in a center tells you). The best objective evaluation of Head Start is that by and large, by itself, it hasn't had much success in preventing educational failure in the elementary grades. Second, serious deficits for many children are usually already visible at 3 years of age.

Point three: Except for the fewer than five per cent of our children born with serious defects or subjected to extreme abuse during the first year of life, serious educational deficits are not usually seen before 18 months of age. This point comes out of the educational and psychological research literature. The same children who are going to give you endless problems in the third grade look fine at age 1.

Point four: Educational failure begins to show itself toward the end of the second year of life. It is often very reliably detected at 3 years of age and nearly always detectable well before the first grade. Furthermore, educational underachievement by children who look average or slightly above average is quite likely, but has not really been investigated in a serious way as yet. After all, the emergency situation, as always, comes first.

What causes low achievement levels in children? Can we as educators do anything about this problem, or are genetics, for example, at the root of the problem? The question is a very complicated one, and I can't deal with it elaborately here. But I will summarize my position on the issue. We have no conclusive evidence as yet as to how much achievement is due to heredity and how much is due to environment. We have fragments of evidence, but nothing like the weight of evidence needed to resolve that issue on a scientific basis. My personal judgment is simply that both heredity and environment obviously play a role. Heredity certainly sets upper limits to development, but by itself it doesn't guarantee that those limits will be reached. If a child is seriously brain damaged, no matter how you work on his early education, he is never going to achieve the levels that an intact, well-educated child will. But if a child comes into the world with great genes, he is not going to make the most of that potential irrespective of what happens to him subsequently. By controlling his experiences, I can prevent any child in the world from learning to talk, I can prevent him from acquiring any of his skills.

Of course those are just the extreme cases. But my point is that so far we really haven't thoroughly understood what it takes to help each child make the most of the potential he has. We have no right to assume that, by hook or by crook, children are doing that. In fact, we have plenty of evidence that suggests that they are not. I've done more direct research on the role of experience in early development than all but a handful of people in the country, and I'm convinced of the power and relevance of early experiences in this area. Certainly until we have definitive evidence to the contrary, the most sensible policy is to assume that early experience makes important differences and to do everything we can to make such experiences as beneficial as possible.

For now, let me point out that there seem to be at least three major obstacles that families face in doing the best job of educating their young children. But let me digress for just a moment. I very much enjoyed Jessie Sargent's remarks, particularly about the wasting of resources and the need for public education, which I endorse. She did, however, refer to developmental day care and its costs in a way that I think may tend to mislead slightly. First of all, developmental day care, as far as I know, generally costs more than $2,000 per year. Three thousand, I think is a better average price, and it can go higher. I agree with Mrs. Sargent that this country is not going to make that kind of money available in the near future for all the kids who ought to have it or who need it. But more importantly, I think there's been a kind of assumption in the minds of some that the way children become educated is through contact with a professional in a classroom or a center; I don't think that's the way it's going to happen, and I don't think that's the way it ought to happen. I think the way it's going to happen is through the family as the first educational delivery system, rather than through a developmental day care center.

The three major obstacles, then, that I see families coping with in trying to do the best they can for their children are: First of all, ignorance. They don't know how to do the job. They don't know, for example, about the poison-control data that says that most of our reported poisonings in childhood take place between 10 and 30 months of age. More importantly, they don't know why such poisonings take place at that age. They don't know that babies in that age range are incredibly curious, are inclined to use the mouth as an exploring organ and are unsophisticated about labels that have warnings on them.

Parents don't know the story of social development. They don't know, for example, that to be a 9-month-old *only* child means to live in a world that is full of happiness, sweetness, pleasant interpersonal relations. On the other hand, to have an older sibling at home who is 2 years old almost invariably means being on the receiving end of genuine hatred from time to time.

Now that sounds funny, but boy I'll tell you, it's a sad thing to watch a 9- or 10-month-old baby, when his mother isn't looking, trying to put up with the real physical threats of a 2- or 2½-year-old child who had previously thought the whole world was built for him. Now he's got to share it with this creature that's into his toys, that seems to have first place in his mother's affections, and so forth. It is painful for everybody. The older child is having a very tough time; the younger one is having a tough time and may be experiencing things that I don't think anybody should have to experience, if we can avoid it. The mother may be having the worst time of all. Some women spend the whole day trying to control two such children, trying to avoid the destruction of the baby; and the father comes home at night and wonders why the mother is tired. The simple fact is we don't prepare or assist people for this job. As long as you can mate, you are eligible to have a child and the responsibilities that go along with it. That's absolutely crazy.

The second major obstacle for parents is stress. The 8- to 24-month period is not only educationally critical, in my opinion, but it's also one of the most dangerous periods in life. I would guess that there is no period of life that is more dangerous in terms of maimings and accidental deaths.

Take, for example, an 8-month-old child who, for the previous three months or so, has had mature visual and auditory capacities, but hasn't been able to move his body anywhere. Move him to an upright posture, he can see out into the room. It's a new world for him; no matter how poor it is, it's all new to him, and somehow or other his species requires that he learn as much as he can during his early developmental years. Think of how much curiosity is building up inside that mind. Then all of a sudden he discovers he can get from here to there — and he goes. It's a very rare child who doesn't go. Children at this age are very much like puppies, kittens, even young horses I've been told, in their pure, unadorned curiosity. It's necessary for the species.

They go, but they don't know anything at all about the world. They don't know that if you lean on something very spindly, it will fall; they don't know that those beautiful rose-colored shards of glass from a broken vase are dangerous. Everything looks interesting, and one of the prime ways in which they explore something first hand is to immediately put it to the mouth. They are very impulsive at that age; they do not stop to smell, to savor or to sip; they just bring it quickly to the mouth.

We have to tell parents about these things. Why should they learn these things after they go to the pediatrician to have a child's stomach pumped? These aren't controversial matters. There's a lot of controversy in this field about some topics, such as how you should rear children, whether you should teach them to read at nine months, whether you should be stroking their limbs at four months for "tactile stimulation." There's a lot of controversy in that area, but there isn't any about safety.

Every family should know how to safety-proof a home for the child's first crawling efforts. Every family should know that a baby starts to climb at about 8 or 9 months of age, can generally only climb six or seven inches at that point, but by the time he's a year old will be able to climb units of 12 to 14 inches, which means that he can climb almost anything in a room. That sequence has very powerful everyday consequences for a family. It should be common knowledge. Why is learning to drive a car so much more important than learning how to parent a child? Does the high school curriculum have room for driver ed and no room for these topics?

Not only are the first years a dangerous period of life, but they mean extra work. The child crawling around the home makes a mess, and if your husband likes a neat home, that adds to the stress. In addition, if there's an older child who is less than three years older than the child, it's quite normal for there to be significant resentment on the part of the older child, and that also adds to the stress on the mother. Furthermore, when the child gets to be 16 or 17 months of age he starts testing his power with his mother. That's quite routine; almost everybody goes through it. Some people find this very tough to take. So, there is a lot of stress involved in raising a young child, and raising two or three closely spaced ones creates almost an intolerable amount. Sometimes it is not tolerated, and women crack up and marriages crack up.

Third obstacle: lack of assistance. Mother usually faces this job alone.

So the three obstacles I see through our research are, first, ignorance — they aren't prepared for the job, they aren't knowledgeable, indeed there's an awful lot of misinformation around; second, stress; and third, lack of assistance. That is a tough collection of obstacles to get through.

If there is a role for education, what is it? We must accept the fact that professional educators, working directly with children, especially children over 6 years of age, have much less influence on development than was previously thought. This is, by the way, the major implication of the 1966 U.S. Office of Education report by James Coleman, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Lots of threads of evidence are contributing to the not/on that professional education after the child is 6 very often just doesn't have the clout that so many parents in this country seem to believe it has, and that so many professional educators somehow assume that they have.

I remember a poignant story about a teacher in IS 201 in the heart of New York about six or seven years ago describing his classroom, a third-grade classroom. He said that at no time could he count on more than 30 per cent of the youngsters to be in their seats, and at no time could he count on more than half of them to even be in the room. And he said, "Somehow or other, I'm not doing well in that class." And I said, "How on earth can you expect to do well in that class?" I think teachers have been taking a terribly bad rap in this country. Educating a child is a partnership between the family and the professional educator. I think the senior partner is the family.

The second thing educators must do is recognize that the family ordinarily is the first educational delivery system for the child and seriously accept and face the consequences of that fact.

Third, we should prepare and assist the family for that fundamental educational job.

How do we prepare and assist the family to give the child a solid educational foundation? Here are a couple of suggestions.

Item one: Long before the child is born, we should teach each and every prospective parent all the known and accepted fundamentals about educational development in the first years of life. How do we do this? I would suggest through required courses in the high schools and, second, through public television. I would also suggest that neither of these vehicles costs a great deal. We might delete the geography of India for a year or for one semester.

Item two: Just before and soon after the baby is born is a special time. A lot of parents are traumatized. They suddenly come face to face with the reality that they've got the responsibility for this fragile little thing and they don't know what they're going to do. That can be a very tough experience. I've had lots of young parents express that fear spontaneously to me. Suggestion: Teach each and every parent whom you missed the first time around the same information and routinely provide refresher information to the remainder. How? Offer adult education courses, year in and year out, for pregnant women and their husbands. Perhaps provide video-cassette or filmed minicourses in hospitals during the lying-in period. That's being done in Hawaii, by the way. Most of these things are being done somewhere in the country. Provide high-quality public television material on a continuous basis. There's no reason why it cannot be done. I'm involved in commercial television right now, talking about educating an infant. It works well. The viewing audience is dedicated; they watch that program like hawks. If I say something wrong, they're right on it. It can be done, and it can be fun, too.

In addition, just before or soon after the child is born, provide a low-cost education early detection and referral service to every family, with a promise that if a family participates, its children cannot go through the preschool years with an undetected educational handicap. You can make that promise and you can deliver on it for about $200 per year for a child. We are running such a service at the Brookline Early Education Project. I think it's a much smarter investment than public kindergarten for everybody.

Item three: After the child is born for his first six years of life, especially the first three, I suggest the following: make available continuing, low-pressure, strictly voluntary training for parents. How? Through resource centers and a home-visiting program. I'm talking, you'll notice, about working through the family, not bypassing it and going directly to the child. Provide for monitoring educational development as an extension of that early detection and referral system, again through medical, psychological and educational teamwork in resource centers, for about $200 a year.

Provide general assistance for parenting, again with a focus on education, in the following ways: Lend materials like toys and books out of your resource center. Have films and pamphlets available. Have professionals available for parents to talk with once in a while. Have other parents available so that people can talk to each other about their frustrations and their joys.

Provide free baby-sitting for psychological relief for parents. This is not day care; I'm talking about a few hours a week when a mother can just leave her child, without guilt, and just get away.

On the other hand, a home-visiting service, especially for families who want it and who have a little more difficulty with their children and fewer resources than average, again does not have to be a frightfully expensive affair. We find that if you go very often to a home, more than every two or three weeks, it gets uncomfortable. There is not enough to do for most families; so if you go for an hour or two every six, seven or eight weeks we guess that's plenty. These kinds of programs are nowhere near as expensive as running a conventional center; nothing like it.

Item four: Provide referral service for special needs, an ombudsman function. How do you do it? Through neighborhood resource centers. Provide remedial assistance as soon as possible. If an early detection program finds a borderline hearing difficulty in a 6-month-old child, we can do things about that today. It's scandalous for this country to continue to let some fraction of our children go through primary language acquisition with untreated, unnoticed hearing deficits. The screening examination can be done for $15 or so and the occasional higher level diagnosis will cost $50 to $75. But what an investment!

I think it's fair to say that the entire task force of the ECS Early Childhood Project agrees with the general desirability of strengthening the family for its role as the child's first educational delivery system. Exactly how far to go in terms of dollars per year, of course, is not fully agreed upon. I suggested to you that for an expenditure of perhaps $300 or $400 per year we probably could do the bulk of what needs doing on this topic for most families (not for the very special-need families; they are a much more expensive proposition). Exactly which ideas to use, again, are not fully agreed upon, but I submit to you that there is a core of fundamental information about safety, about social development, about motor development that most people do agree on, and that such information could be very, very useful to young families. Much needed assistance is feasible today. You could spend $1,000 a year for an average family, but I think you could do it quite nicely for $400 or $500. And there just isn't a better way to spend that money than to invest in improving the quality of our earliest educational systems.

Public Policy and Early Childhood Education: A Buddhist Garden

**Edwin W. Martin, Acting Deputy
Commissioner, Bureau of Education
for the Handicapped,
U.S. Office of Education**

Public policy in the area of provision of preschool and early childhood services seems destined to be based on the same assumptions that my wife and I use in what she has called our Buddhist approach to gardening. That is, we begin with a reverence for all living things, and then we allow them to grow around our house as they will. I can report to you that this approach involves a minimum of prior planning, that the results are judged to be uneven at best by third-party evaluators, and that later revisions are costly and difficult.

I am tempted to say that I am here today to raise some questions about delivery systems for early childhood education. For example, who shall be responsible? Should our goal be to develop a publicly supported delivery system, or should we assume an essential role for the private sector in our planning for full services for all children? Should we assign responsibility to a single public agency, or should we assume that employing many agencies will provide "creative pluralism" or will allow "flexibility"?

I am going to resist attempting to pass myself off as a neutral statesman, dispassionately raising these questions, merely to assure that those of you legislators, state executives and board members who create public policy would be sure to attend to these important concerns. Not only do many of you know that I am a constitutionally predetermined advocate-type, but I feel my label as an education official might seem to mar my credibility as a dispassionate observer.

So, here are my propositions:

1. Public policymakers should "bite the bullet" and begin the process of making a specific decision about where the responsibility for early childhood education services should be lodged. No more Buddhist gardening.

2. Public policy must be based on the assumption of equal access for all children, and so a public system must be developed based on this "zero reject" concept. Private agencies can offer alter-

natives for those who can afford them, or serve as subcontractors for the public agency.

3. A single public agency should be charged with the primary responsibility.

4. That agency should be the public education agency.

Now, I am tempted to sit down, or perhaps go home, rather than elaborate, but I warned you about my incurable advocacy impulses. Actually, lecturing a group of early childhood specialists and policymakers about early childhood policy making, reminds me of the time Robert Kennedy, then attorney general, came to speak at the University of Alabama, soon after the governor had stood in the gymnasium door, (euphemistically known as a schoolhouse, but more accurately the site of registration activities). The governor was incensed by the attorney general's visit — to say nothing of how he felt about the university for inviting him — and said it "was like inviting the fox into the chicken coop," a metaphor that was met with mixed enthusiasm by the university community. When at last Kennedy stood safely on the stage inside the notorious Foster Auditorium, he made note of the governor's remarks, saying that he felt "more like the chicken in a fox coop." I think you can see the parallel between his feelings and mine.

My first proposition, concerning the need for a decision, is based on the belief that we will have universal preschool and early education, and that we will evolve into it in a somewhat random fashion by extending public school programs by expanding Head Start, by developing new federal initiatives in family and child services such as those proposed by the recently reintroduced Mondale and Brademas bills, by developing new state offices of child or human development, by developing day care centers and community health and mental health programs, and by working with a variety of private profit and nonprofit agencies.

I think such a development process will result in all of the problems we now see in many of our government programs: conflicting responsibilities and assumptions, duplication and overlap, gaps and uneveness of access, wide variations in quality of services, etc. — a litany you surely know as well as I. Further, we are dealing with a tremendously large potential population: 17.2 million children between birth and 5 years of age, and 20 million more between 5 and 9, to mark arbitrary end points. I believe it is accurate to say that no formalized public-service delivery system other than the schools deals with such a large population and its attendant logistical problems.

Governors, legislators, public officials and even we professionals must face this issue squarely and establish firm patterns for the development of services. Further, every effort must be made to provide a basis for coherent federal policy by interstate and federal planning.

My further propositions merge into the proposal that the public education agency be identified as the lead agency, or primary provider of services. I am aware that this proposal, while somewhat more acceptable than Jonathan Swift's "Modest Proposal" that citizens eat their babies as a solution to food supply and population problems, still will have its antagonists in two major groups — first, those child development specialist who operate in nonpublic school environments and, second, those persons who run the schools — or to be more fair perhaps some substantial part of each group.

But the needs for coherent public policy must outweigh the provincial concerns of special-interest groups. If the school administrators or school boards are reluctant to take on this role, but we believe it to be in the public interest, this reluctance can be overcome. Recent examples that come to mind include providing educational opportunity for black and for handicapped children.

The fact is that there are many reasons for policymakers to consider the schools as the preferred service delivery mechanism. Without elaborating, let me name a few. There is a broad local and state fiscal base already extant that is designated for these basic purposes, i.e., the development and enhancement of the child's potential through the process we can define "broadly" as education. There are examples, already, of basing support for early childhood education on adaptations of state-aid formulas for education. There are buildings and the capacity for financing new construction or for remodeling exists. Further, the decline in birth rate is already reducing the crowding in many schools and this pattern seems likely to continue. Although many early childhood programs, such as home-based programs, would not need school building space, still others could use such facilities and are now housed in substandard facilities.

In addition, the public education system has the capacity to set standards, to certify, regulate, etc. While we are aware of the dangers of "over credentialing," appropriate standards will be desirable. The capacity to train educators and specialists is in place, and it, too, is seeking new avenues for development. I am not suggesting simply retraining "surplus" teachers, although many good early childhood specialists might be found in such populations; rather I am looking toward the capabilities of universities to develop new and effective early childhood education training programs to meet the changing demands of their students.

Finally, the schools are already moving in the direction of providing early childhood services, particularly in relation to services for handicapped children. Several states now mandate the provision of education, including comprehensive services, to handicapped children from age 3, and a number have provided what we call permissive legislation — that is, local districts may provide and be reimbursed for programs beginning as soon after birth as a child may be identified as handicapped.

These efforts are in the early stages, but they show a rapid growth rate. The evidence that effective programming can ameliorate or prevent later educational handicaps is such that we have made stimulating such programming a major priority of the U.S. Office of Education. In short, it seems likely that the public schools will offer preschool services to all handicapped children within the foreseeable future. Will some other agency provide parallel services to nonhandicapped children with all the attendent problems of continuity of programming when the youngsters reach school age? I hope not.

In identifying the schools as the prime service delivery agency, I recognize that many of the children we hope to serve will require what we have come to call "comprehensive" programs — that is, they will require special attention to their nutritional needs, health needs, etc. Further, a basic direction for such programming seems to require a major emphasis on strengthening the ability of the family to help meet the multiple needs of the child, rather than trying to replace the family with a social agency. I see none of this as inconsistent with the future role of schools as a total community resource. For example, the education system already has accepted the responsibility for responding to the nutritional needs of children, and there is increasing concern about improving the quality of the health-delivery system within the schools. I do not foresee the school system as necessarily having to supply all health and related services, but it can certainly take on the role of assisting and aiding parents in the location and receipt of needed services.

A recent study done by Rand for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare described the need for such "direction" centers, as they called them, as being a paramount concern if we are to respond appropriately to an estimated population of nine million children with various handicapping conditions, to say nothing of perhaps an equal number of nonhandicapped, economically disadvantaged youngsters with similar needs.

Among our objectives for improved services for handicapped children will be to encourage through model programs, and through the use of other federal funds, the development of identification and appraisal programs, direction centers and full educational programs for youngsters beginning as early in life as feasible. We have learned from many of our efforts for handicapped children that the tools and skills of the special education profession are most effective for dealing with nonhandicapped children as well.

In sum, we will be working to build comprehensive programs within the schools that will provide a basis for high-quality services for handicapped children beginning very early in life. I see no reason why these goals for the school system should be limited to services for handicapped children and should not be seen as the basis for similar programming for all children.

The "clear and present danger," to coin a phrase, is that those of us who see ourselves as the creators of public policy will continue a laissez-faire attitude, immobilized between various pressure groups and restrained by budgetary problems. This will lead us to all the problems in this area to which I have referred and to much rhetoric about wasteful duplication, overlap, etc. Study commissions will be appointed to see how to coordinate programs; new offices will be proposed, perhaps sitting right in the governor's anteroom to be sure they will have sufficient "clout," and so on.

In summary, then, while it may be fair enough to say to the public, "I never promised you a rose garden," I don't think we want to deliver them a Buddhist garden instead.

Organizing to Deliver Services: Alternative Approaches

Moderator
Jule Sugarman
Chief Administrative Officer,
Atlanta, Ga.

Panel
Benjamin Carmichael
Commissioner of Education, Tennessee

Hubert Humphrey III
State Senator, Minnesota

David Liederman
Director, Office for Children,
Massachusetts

Barbara Mosses
Chief of Contracts, Grants and Special
Services Division, Department of Social
Services, South Carolina

Jule Sugarman: One of the things that has always gratified me about ECS is the fact that it is one of the few professional organizations I know that has had the courage to bring into their tent a lot of outsiders. In fact, on the Early Childhood Task Force, less than half the members are people identified with the public education system. As a result, we get a kind of dialogue and development of ideas that one does not find among people who are all drawn from the same group.

Edwin Martin has publicly set forth a challenge for me to respond to his very effective and carefully analyzed speech. Actually, this is sort of a conspiracy on the part of the two of us because we believe that the time has come when the early childhood field needs serious public debate about where it ought to go and how it ought to get there.

I want to make my position as clear as I can to begin with. My arguments today and in the past and in the future are not arguments that the public school system should not operate, should not control, should not coordinate, early childhood programs. My arguments are that there should not be either an automatic monopoly or an automatic preference for the public school system to do this sort of thing. I will basically argue that that kind of decision needs to be made, not on the federal level or even on the state level, but at the local level where the programs are actually delivered. There should be the flexibility and the choice in each state and in each community to pick the particular administrative vehicle they feel can best handle the job. That may end up, in many places, as being the public school system. I suspect, though, that if matters were honestly considered, that it would end up being other than the public school system in many situations.

Now, Mr. Martin set forth some rather clear-cut hypotheses. I hope that I can equal that in terms of the principles that I set forth. Number one: Early childhood programs, conceived broadly as they ought to be, are essentially different in character from the programs operated by the public school systems. It would, in fact, be a great mistake to conceive of early childhood as simply an extension downward of the conventional classroom situation. I believe, for example, that probably the great majority of young children in this country do not require a classroom-type education program in the early childhood years. I believe to the contrary that what we need is a variety of programs so that the one that is right for a particular family — and I want to emphasize "family" — and a particular child, is the one that's available. That may mean nothing more than a play school; it may mean dealing not at all with the child but only with the parent; or it may mean dealing with the child and parent together. It may mean a nursery school, or it may mean kindergarten. It may mean a lot of things.

I think, for example, that in many ways the enthusiasm and action that has been generated to initiate public kindergartens across the country has some drawbacks to it; that it may have, in fact, concentrated a fair amount of dollar resources in a program that was either unnecessary or of the wrong order for many of the children for whom it was designed. It is hard for me to argue against it because it is a little like motherhood, and in many places it has done good things for children. I would argue, however, that we might very well, even now, consider whether those same resources could be applied in different ways to achieve more results with more families and more children.

Before I go further, let me say that I am willing to negotiate with Mr. Martin. If I could be assured that the education system would take one-twelfth of its resources and devote them entirely to working with families and young children, I would concede the argument of sponsorship. I think that is not an impossible matter. I think, in fact, our education system from the elementary through the high school levels is probably too long for most youngsters today, that we do not need four years of high school or six years of junior high and senior high. While we constantly talk about reevaluation of priorities and reallocation of monies, nobody is seriously addressing the question of wehther the total dollars that we are investing in the education field could not be reallocated in a way that would provide money where it is needed — in my judgment, in the early childhood area. However, since I do not expect you to be able to make that one-twelfth commitment, I have to continue with my enunciation of principles.

My first one, of course, was that school programs and early childhood programs are different in character and that you need an organization that has the capacity and flexibility to deliver those different programs. That is why I think some of Mr. Martin's arguments about the availability of school facilities and the availability of trained elementary school teachers are not really relevant, because those are not necessarily the facilities and skills we need to deliver early childhood programs.

My second position or hypothesis is that there is, inherently, no strength of a professional nature in an education system that is automatically better or worse than the strength of a professional system in the social work field, in the health care field, in the mental health field or in the early childhood field (if you can separate that out). I find, in fact, that when individuals are confronted with a specific human being — whether they are a social worker or an educator or a mental health specialist — that they do not deal with that child in fundamentally different ways.

We have created, it seems to me, a mythology that educators know how to educate children and health care people know how to provide health care and mental health people know how to deal with mental health, when in fact, to a very substantial degree, they overlap one another in their professional competence or in the things that they actually do for children. We all talk about the whole child, and yet we keep on trying to carve him up professionally or bureaucratically. I think that is a mistake.

No particular profession or bureaucratic institution has a monopoly on being better able to do things. I have had the chance over the years, because of my involvement with Head Start, the Children's Bureau and the U.S. Office of Child Development, to visit probably close to 1,000 programs around the country, and I must say I cannot tell you that any one institution is better or worse, even on an average basis, at developing and delivering services to children. I have seen school systems that do a fantastically good job of that and I have seen school systems that do an abysmally bad job of it. I have seen the same thing with respect to community action or Head Start agencies, the same thing with respect to health care and social service agencies. And I have come to believe that the capacity of organizations to do this relates much more clearly to the individuals who are involved and their capacities and their philosophies, and to the situation in that community, than it does to whether there is a particular kind of profession or a particular kind of institution involved.

My third hypothesis is that the most relevant factor of all in selecting the institution to have the authority over early childhood programs relates basically to individual capacity, individual attitude and individual competence. Mr. Martin posited certain things which he suggested were advantageous to the public school system in that respect, and I'd like to run through that list for just a moment.

He said, for example, that the school system has a tax base, which offers a good point to start in terms of funding early childhood programs. That's true; in most communities the school system does have a tax base. In almost all of those communities it's the property tax base, and I think nothing has become more apparent than the inequities of the property tax, both in terms of what it does to the taxpayer and in terms of what it delivers to communities that need service. We've had a very substantial number of cases and decisions in the state courts and in the appellate courts that have, in effect, said that the property tax is no longer a viable means of supporting public education because it provides a lot of money for communities that have wealthy people living in them and a lousy return for those communities that are poor. So, if we're talking about a tax base that's the property tax base, I would argue that that's a disadvantage rather than an advantage of the public school system.

Mr. Martin talked about existing buildings and available space. As I've indicated before, these may be useful for certain kinds of programs under certain circumstances. But, if we're going to go into an elementary school that has three empty classrooms and then have, without question, to lock young children into that school's routine, then I don't want early childhood programs in that school. If we're not going to be able to eat in a community style because everybody eats in a cafeteria at the assigned 15-minute period, I don't want to use those buildings and facilities. In other words, if that school and that space are available only on the terms of a conventional school program, then I think we ought to turn the offer down.

I am not saying that every school is like that, because they're not. There are marvelous principals and teachers who have really changed their schools around, and where they do I think we ought to recognize it and use it. But it is not the universal practice.

Mr. Martin suggests that the public schools are practiced in the setting of standards and the certification of staff. I have to say that I think that that experience is a disastrous experience, that it has led to the growth of a credentialism philosophy that has very little, if any, relevance to the capacity of teachers to perform. Now that is an extreme position. I happen to believe it is a correct position. I am not against a system of evaluation and standards. I am against what I see put forth as a system of evaluation and standards in most of the public school systems with which I am familiar. I see some movement away from it in recent years as the use of performance evaluations, in addition to conventional credentials, has become more widespread.

The availability of surplus teachers is a fact, I think, in many communities now. The question is, are they the right teachers? Are they the teachers who have been, in fact, prepared to work with children at earlier years, to work with parents in the way they need to be worked with in preschool years? The answer is "yes" in some cases and "no" in many others. And nothing could be worse in the early childhood field than to automatically transfer everybody who loses their job as an elementary teacher to an early childhood program. Those of you who were around in the first summer of Head Start will remember some of the experiences that we had with that policy of using elementary school teachers. Again, I don't want to condemn all elementary school teachers; many of them have the necessary capacity and flexibility. But you need to make the choice on the facts in that community, not on some universal basis.

Mr. Martin said, and I think correctly, that many school systems are already moving toward a more flexible approach, and I say more power and more help to them in doing it, if it is well done. I do not want to push anybody out of this business; in fact I have argued for many years now that there is so much to do that we really need the involvement of everybody. We need the social agencies, we need the health agencies, we need the private nonprofit organizations, and I would even argue we need the for-profit organizations, although I do that with some caveats about how they get used. I believe that that job out there is so tremendous that there is room for everybody to be actively involved in it.

Finally, Mr. Martin suggested that the continuity of programming was an important aspect of placing early childhood within the orbit of the public school system. I have to agree, theoretically, that that is an important concept. I must say that I am not impressed with the evidence that there is any continuity in the public school system as it now exists. I say you can see very little relationship in most schools between what the second-grade teacher does and what the third-grade teacher does, and certainly not between what the elementary school teacher does and the junior high school and the senior high school teachers do. I think continuity is one of those things that one assumes happens when you have a unitary organization, but which bureaucratically and factually rarely occurs. So, I have serious doubts that it will happen to any greater extent in the early childhood area.

Senator Hubert Humphrey mentioned to me earlier that in his community, for the first time, after many years of having both preschool and school-age programs, the teachers got together for a meeting. Now, that does not mean they are working together, but they at least took that first step of getting together for a meeting. It is a very real bureaucratic problem — and it is a *bureaucratic* problem, not a professional question. It is a question of how do you make it happen.

Now I have been tilting at windmills here and knocking down straw dogs; what have I got to offer instead? What I offer instead is not a choice, but a method of making a choice, a method of analyzing the situation in a particular state and a particular community. I would like to list what I think are the important elements of analysis so that you can decide whether it is the school system, the health care system, the social service system, the governor's office or the community action agency, etc., that should have authority over early childhood programs in your community.

Organizations are supposed to be built on principle and not on people. I am not sure that is a good idea. If I had to make a choice, *de novo*, in my community, I would look for that group of people with the most enthusiasm and the most energy and the most concern for young children, and I would give them a big plus to start with, regardless of where they were bureaucratically. I would look at them in terms of their flexibility, in terms of their willingness to do things differently, in terms of their zeal, if you will, because I just happen to think that zealousness and commitment are a major determinant of how well an organization does its job. You have some risks there, admittedly. You may pick one group of people and they may go overboard in their approach; then you've got the wrong organization. But to pick an organization without a look at who is actually going to do the job — what is that curriculum division like, what is that superintendent like, what is that school board like — I think is a mistake.

Second, I think that you must carefully examine the legal constraints that would affect that agency. Is there anything in the state constitution that is established and probably unchangeable? Is there anything in the state laws that is going to seriously limit the capacity of that organization to do the job that needs to be done? For example, is there a prohibition in the law or state constitution against using anyone but certified teachers in working with children? Is there a legal requirement that programs be conducted in a specific kind of facility, a school building? Is there a law that delimits the hours? Is there something in the law that says the teacher or the staff cannot go into the child's home? Is there something in the law that prohibits the use of nonprofessionals? Is there something in the law that prohibits the influence of parents on the program, that in fact says that there cannot be real program participation? All laws can be changed, but you have to make a solid assessment of the possibility of changing those laws. For example, if the question is the hours worked for school teachers, are you going to be able to change that law when its impact will be not only on the early childhood teachers but on all other school teachers? You really have to look at that kind of question and see whether people have the flexibility to do what needs to be done.

Third, you have to look at this question of the financial capacity of the organization to do the job. You can have the greatest people in the world and the greatest zealousness, but if they do not have the legal capacity and, more importantly, the influence to get the state budget bureau and the state governor and the members of the legislature and the general public to support what they are doing — if you do not have that kind of leadership, forget it. You are just not going to move anywhere with these early childhood programs. In some cases it is clear that the education system has an advantage; its financial base is already established. In other states, unfortunately, the education system is basically in disrepute with the legislature and is not able to demonstrate that kind of competence. Again, I do not think any one organization has a natural ability to do it better than anybody else.

Another kind of question, it seems to me, is the attitude of the agency toward parent participation. Parent participation does have different meanings and there is disagreement about its proper scope. But I think there is no one today who will not argue that it is important to involve parents in one way or another — whether it means merely being present in the classroom at times or being in dialogue with the staff, or whether it means being involved in decision making about curriculum and about program and about hiring of personnel. There are all sorts of ranges that are possible there, but some institutions are inherently opposed to any of that, or will accept it only in minor degree. I do not think that kind of institution can successfully operate an early childhood program, and I would frankly seek out that institution that was most committed to a meaningful and rational involvement of parents.

I would not go to an institution that is so weak in its professional and administrative capacity that it is capable of being drummed under the table by a parent group, and particularly a parent group that may not be a representative parent group. You know, we can go too far in that direction as well. But I would clearly look for and seek out that institution that has an emotional commitment and the realistic legal capacity to be able to deal with parent involvement in a meaningful way. I would seek out the institution that shows the greatest capacity to develop a flexible program, to incorporate everything from a conventional nursery school to play groups, to working directly with parents to working with children in individual settings. I would seek out that institution that has, or can have, the kind of relationships with the other professional disciplines that will, in fact, permit them to work together — that can talk to the medical community, that can talk to the social services community, that can talk to the community action community and that can devise some effective relationships with them.

All of those things create, at least in my mind, a vision of a sort of a perfect organization that you ought to have in an early childhood program. Experience and realism tell me that you aren't going to find an agency that can do all of those things and do them well. Whatever choice you make, you're going to get some limitations. You may get a really good community action agency that seems fine, except that the school system hates its guts and you know you will get a tremendous clash between them. Or, you may find a really good school system that the medical profession has boycotted and will not have anything to do with. You are going to have to make some choices, not on the basis of perfection but on the basis of what is the best possible development.

You are going to have to make a choice that is politically acceptable, a choice that can be sold to the legislature, sold to the governor and sold to the general public. It cannot be something that merely represents the consensus of professional early childhood judgment. It must be something that can be defended and explained to other people — and that very specifically includes explaining that this is not competitive, duplicative, overlapping and wasteful. Those will be arguments that you will face, no matter what system you try to choose, if it is different from what people have in mind.

I suspect, frankly, that some day we will come to the position in this country where the education system, as distinct from the public school system, will become the dominant force in early childhood and will provide basically this kind of service for all children. But, I want them to earn their spurs. I want them to do that by changing now, by becoming flexible now, by using other agencies as part of the system; I want them to show that they're willing to contract with other organizations, that they are willing to use volunteer organizations, willing to use community groups, willing, in fact, to develop a total education system.

• • •

Hubert Humphrey III: There is no doubt in my mind that what we are talking about — the implementing of programs — is the real crux of the political issue. It is a very tough problem that obviously must be approached and solved in different manners in every one of the states. In Minnesota, we are still continuing to face the challenge of deciding where and how to coordinate the implementation of the early childhood and family service programs. I would like briefly to go through the legislation that Senator Jerome Hughes and I and others had a part in developing and passing. Perhaps that legislation will provide an example of how one state is dealing with this question.

In the spring of this year, during the second half of our annual legislative session, which by the way was the first time that Minnesota had an annual session, we passed some experimental legislation that would establish an administrative structure and funding for six pilot projects for early identification and early childhood education. The programs, for children from birth to 6 years of age, were funded by a state appropriation of $250,000. In addition, a state agency, the Minnesota Council on Quality Education, was designated to coordinate and to contract for the projects. This agency, I believe, meets Mr. Sugarman's criteria for having a broad range of view and a great deal of flexibility. It is a 17-member board, which is all volunteer.

Eight members represent the various professional organizations in the educational field. Eight other members are lay members, each one from a congressional district; in addition, there is one at-large appointee; these nine are appointed by the governor. Together they are the group that sponsors experimental legislation and funds experimental projects through the educational system in Minnesota. Money for those programs is funded from the legislature to the council. In a sense, this gives some flexibility within our school structure for funding through our state program.

The legislation that was passed provides for the development of programs, including identification of potential barriers to learning, education of parents in child development, libraries of educational materials, family services, education for parenthood programs in secondary schools, in-center activities, home-based programs and referral services. The programs are equally distributed: there will be two in the urban centers, two in the suburbs and two in the rural communities. Each project will serve one elementary school attendance area in the local school district. We have tried to bring the structure of the projects to the local community level of that attendance area. That does not necessarily mean that the whole thing has to be run out of that school, or out of that school structure. In fact, among the various projects there are a number that operate through organizations other than through the public education system.

The legislation also mandates that a preference be given to programs with the ability to coordinate services with other existing programs. The Council on Quality Education is required to report annually to the legislature's education committees. In addition, the legislation requires separate accounting of the funds expended on the programs, so that we in the legislature and more on the Council on Quality Education can monitor the expenditures and the results of these programs. There is an opportunity for reasonable fees to be charged, but those fees must be waived in the event that a child or a parent is unable to pay for the services.

On the state level, the council is required to appoint an advisory committee to oversee the progress of the projects. This advisory committee has already been appointed and includes a number of parents who are involved in the programs. The State Board of Education is required to give assistance in seeking funds from federal programs and federal grants and also to provide technical and professional assistance.

Each pilot program must have an advisory committee, selected by the local board of education, a majority of whose members must be parents participating in the programs. These local advisory committees must also make regular reports both to the Council on Quality Education and to another council or committee on the local level, the local Community Education Advisory Committee. In each one of our school districts, we have a lay group known as the Community Education Advisory Committee, which develops a program for each school district for educational programs other than the formal K-12 type of school structure. This council is a very broad-based local community group. I know that is true, at least in my district, because I'm a member of that local advisory committee; we have everyone from the social services all the way to the senior citizens, the handicapped, students and many other people and parents involved in that committee. We design our own community education program and we are funded independently; so there is, in a sense, an independent structure at the local level. The pilot programs for early childhood and family services, and the advisory committee to the pilot programs, must also report to this local council so that they are aware of what the local community is doing in the project area.

Things have moved quickly since the bill was passed. The Council on Quality Education has forwarded information to every school district, informing them about the opportunity to apply for the projects. By the filing deadline, which was in the latter part of June, 43 proposals had been submitted. The council, through a series of operating meetings, has finally decided on six projects that provide a variety of services.

For example, in the city of South St. Paul, which is a suburb of St. Paul, the project involves a monthly newsletter to every family with young children, a parent library located at the elementary school, neighborhood discussion groups that frequently organize programs of their own and parenting classes sponsored by the county mental health center.

In Staples, Minn., which is a small rural farming community, the emphasis is different. It is on home-based programs and the outreach program necessary in rural communities. Staples has also evolved an assessment structure, which will be very interesting to see in operation. There is also parental instruction and demonstration, a counseling and referral program and an involvement training center. A community coordianting center brings together all the information on local early childhood and family services so that anyone interested in getting that kind of information need go only to one place, rather than tracking down all the different programs individually.

In St. Paul, an urban area project, the target population of the elementary school attendance area is low to middle income. There are four coordinating components in the program: screening and follow-through of services, a resource lending library, family education and training program, and education for parenthood.

I think that you can see by these descriptions that our legislation attempted to avoid the head-on collision between the state department of education and the department of welfare. When the legislation was introduced, there certainly was heat. It was introduced late into the session and was moved along in a rather smart way. But there are an awful lot of people who, when they see that their group or organization or agency is not going to receive the substantial funds a program like this involves, are going to strongly oppose such a program, whether or not they are in sympathy with the concept.

The concept that we attempted to pursue here is that the emphasis must be on the community level; that if parents and other persons in the community do not understand the program and are not personally interested and involved in it, then it's not going to work in any event. So we need to coordinate and structure the program through the most local entity. In Minnesota, we have determined that that is the elementary school attendance area. I think that we are going to find out if that is really correct. That is one reason why we have designated this as an experimental project.

There are a couple questions that I think we will have to raise with regard to our legislation. First, we have to make a proper analysis of these pilot programs to determine the amount of coordination that can be accomplished at the local level and to what extent we need statewide assistance in that coordination. We eed to look at how the state structure relates to the local organization and how effective it is in providing assistance.

Another question that needs to be raised is will the administrative structure, which is handled by the local public school board, hinder the supply of other child care services in the medical, social and welfare areas? We will have to see whether coordination by the local advisory council committees is sufficient to incorporate the other services that are available at the local level.

So, in review of Mr. Sugarman's checklist, I think we measure up pretty closely to his criteria. All in all, however, from a legislative point of view, I think the matter of implementation must be examined according to each state's given problems and administrative structure. In Minnesota, rather than taking on one agency or another, we have tried to circumvent the conflict by going right down to the people and to the families, to help them develop in their own community the standards and types of structures that they see as most important and necessary.

• • •

David Liederman: The subject is "organizing to deliver services." When I say "services," I mean more than just programs for early childhood development, because we need to talk about a whole range of services for young children. To me that means day care for infants and toddlers as well as for other preschoolers, and it means day care in group centers and family day-care homes and systems; it means homemaker services for families; it means counseling programs; it means family foster care for those children who need it; it means day care for all special-needs children who need it whether they are physically handicapped, retarded or otherwise severely impaired; it means day-treatment programs. We are really talking about a whole range of services, not just building centers for early childhood development programs.

I think if we put it in that context, it is easier to deal with the business of how you organize to deliver those services, because clearly, it means that you cannot rely just on education or just on the human service-delivery system to do it. You have to put a combination system together, and whatever is appropriate, you use it. I am sure it depends on the state and the kind of machinery that state has to conduct its business and to deliver the services. Here in Massachusetts, all human services are in an Executive Office of Human Services, which includes the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Public Welfare, the Department of Youth Services and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission and Corrections. There is a separate Executive Office of Education that includes departments responsible for public school education, higher education and education for children with special needs.

So we have two main systems in this state — education and human services — that for the first time are coming together and working together to organize a delivery system that can get the services out there to the two million children in our state who need them. The new special education law in this state, Chapter 766, which goes into effect this September 1974, mandates that every public school in the state must provide for the education of all children with special needs between the ages of 3 and 21. This clearly involves the public school system with two groups it has not previously served — the 3- to 5-year-olds and the 16- to 21-year-olds. It means that in many instances the public school system will be purchasing services from the private sector, from nonprofit groups, particularly for young children. When we talk about clinical nursery programs for the retarded or for the physically handicapped, or for other young special-needs children, clearly it would be in the interest of the public school system to buy those services from programs that are already operating programs for that group, rather than to try to develop new programs themselves. In other areas of the state, where we don't have programs in place, it might be in the interest of the local school district to try to develop and operate new programs. That is why I say I do not really care who does it, as long as we do it, as long as we get the services out there and figure out how to put them together.

I think the business of orchestrating a delivery service that is comprehensive, with the range of services I described, that is available in every area of the state for all the children who need them, is an enormous task. It is an enormous task from an administrative point of view, but an even greater task from the financial point of view, coming up with the dollars for all these services. I really believe that the only way it is going to happen in other states is the way it happened here. They will do endless amounts of planning, surveys and needs-assessment studies. They will have volumes and volumes of materials that show how many kids need braces and how many children need to be immunized, and they will inch along with demonstration programs, which are good, such as those Senator Humphrey described.

But as I was sitting here listening, I was trying to divide $250,000 by six programs and trying to figure out all the things that he said they were going to do in these six programs for $250,000. I came to the conclusion that there is no inflation in Minnesota, that something different is happening in Minnesota than is happening here in Massachusetts. We are talking about lots of money; we have kids in developmental programs, special-needs programs, that cost $12,000 a year per child.

So if you are talking about putting out a full range of services, you are talking about big money. In the long run, the political system does not really give a damn about facts and figures and needs studies and all the data; that is not the way the decisions get made. That is not to say these things are not important; I think they are. And I am not knocking planning; I think it is great and I think we should do it; but I think that in and of itself it is not going to make it happen. If Howard Schrag does a needs study in Idaho that tells me that X number of children in Idaho need this, this and that; and Barbara Mosses does an assessment in South Carolina that says they need this; then it seems to me obvious that they need it in Massachusetts, too. Are the children in South Carolina or Idaho different from children in Massachusetts, or are the children in Missouri different from children in Minnesota? We know what children need; we absolutely know this already. I do not need a damned thing more to tell me what they need. I know we need to provide homemaker services; I know we need to provide counseling programs; I know we need to provide developmental day care; and I know we need to offer these services in far greater numbers than we do now, because every single program that we have in place has waiting lists. The needs are obvious, and we do not need more studies to tell us what we have to do. The real question is, how do you get the money?

The one clear way you get the money is with a constituency, because in our government, the constituencies get the money. The squeaky wheel does indeed get the grease. I think we have a lesson to learn from senior citizens. Senior citizens in this country over the last few years have done a marvelous job of organizing and making their voices heard. They have been heavily involved politically and have become very politically astute; and they are turning out some money because they got themselves organized and they are facing the politicians head on. They are saying, Hey, this is what we need. And Massachusetts has now passed the first guaranteed annual income program in this state for senior citizens. In the same way, because of the efforts of over 39 area councils for children, which now have 15,000 active members, the governor has signed a cost-of-living increase for recipients of Aid to Families With Dependent Children, the first one they have had in four years. So when you talk about how to get the money and how to put it out there, obviously you have to have a vocal constituency.

About two years ago, Massachusetts passed a law that set up the state Office for Children. If I were a legislator, I would want to grab that thing and run with it. I think that, besides all the altruistic reasons for doing it, there is a little bit of political advantage involved as well, because it is hard for folks to be against children. And it is particularly hard for people to be against the establishment of an office for children that is going to do such great things. In setting up the Massachusetts Office for Children, one of the things that was called for was the development of 39 Councils for Children in the 39 human service planning areas throughout the state. The legislation spells out the statutory responsibilities that these councils have, including the power to review and make recommendations for approval and disapproval of funding of programs. Thus, this year's Children's Budget — which provides $20 million in new money for children's services and which the legislature passed in July 1974 — provides for allocations of $130,000 per council area, and each council decides which programs in its area get the money.

There is also money available to fund individual children with special needs. If a child needs a special program, the Office for Children will write a purchase-of-service contract with an agency to provide moneys for that child, and then we will try to get one of the major service agencies to pick it up once we get it going, and to keep it going.

It's been, to me, a very exciting experience over the past year and a half to see all these folks get together at the local level and give out $5 million to start new programs — all kinds of programs, some very innovative — to expand some existing programs and to begin to set some priorities. One of the programs the office will have in place in September 1974, in 24 of the 39 areas, is a program called "Help for Children." This is a child advocacy program that consists of having staff in an office that can handle calls and help get children and their families through the bureaucracy. This program will also identify those children with special needs whom our office ought to fund, because we felt there is no one else who can handle that particular problem.

These councils now represent a constituency that is not going to be denied. These people are going to work in their own communities, they are going to come together when they have a common agenda on state issues, and I am absolutely convinced that we are going to begin to put together a state delivery system in Massachusetts that will continually put more money into all of the services that I have described.

We are close to putting together an integrated delivery system across the state so that each of those 39 areas has day care for low-income families. The Children's Budget provides moneys to start a sliding fee-scale day-care program for working parents who are not eligible under Title IV-A. We are going to get that off the ground this year. We will also have developmental programs for young children who have special needs, family foster care available for those who need it, homemaker services available for families. When you get involved with families where there is child abuse or neglect, for example, you need someone to go in, you need someone to do some social work, you probably need homemaker services, you probably need day care, you probably need a range of things for that family.

I am not sure that our legislation fits every state, but our model seems to fit in Massachusetts. I am sure there are other models that would be equally appropriate for other states. I would urge all state legislators, agency directors and policymakers to consider taking similar action to bring comprehensive and coordinated services to all the children and families in their individual states.

• • •

Barbara Mosses: I will not attempt to tell you the story of South Carolina, but rather to offer some broad guidelines for how to deliver services. I would call it a "3-C" proposition. First, you must have Commitment. If you have commitment, then you have to establish Communications. After you've established communications, you can then establish Cooperation in order to maximize your available resources. There are many delivery systems at all levels providing services to young children. There are various delivery systems in administration, in technical assistance, in training and also in evaluation and planning. As has already been said, there are no good methods that would be applicable across the United States. You have to go back to what Mr. Sugarman said: Look at those people who appear to be the most commited to providing these services and work from there.

In South Carolina we have a little bit of all of this. We have no solid network like the one in Massachusetts. However, we have statewide delivery of services to young children through commitment, through communications and through cooperation. We have those three C's at our state and regional levels, and we have them on the very local level. We have four primary delivery systems in the state. One is the private delivery system — which includes private for-profit and private nonprofit organizations. There is a Head Start delivery system; there is a state department of education delivery system and a department of social services delivery system. All of these happen to be intermeshed and intertwined. There is no way to say you have one delivery system in any state. However, you are always going to need to have committed people involved. If you can continue to get those three C's, then you will be able to deliver those services that Mr. Liederman says every child needs.

• • •

Ben Carmichael: I have tried to analyze our topic in a different way than the other members of the panel have. If I take our subject, "Organizing to Deliver Services: Alternative Approaches," and if you would permit me to translate that as "organizing to implement child development programs," then I wish to analyze the subject by functions that I think are required for the implementation of such programs. I am greatly concerned that, from the federal level down to the individual home and child, we establish operations that represent good management to an extent far beyond what I see in operation at this time.

I am going to define five functions. Two or three of them are very critical to us, I think. The first is common to every activity and therefore I will not dwell on it, but unless someone gives greater attention to the definition of functions that organizations are responsible for, then I think we're going to see another 50 or 100 years of insufficiency and inefficiency in the delivery of services.

The first function is common to every organization: the function of internal management, which simply means the things we do to manage the organization. There can be no organization that does not perform this function, and yet for many of us, in an office of education or an office of child development, if we really tried to determine who performs this function, how it is performed and what principles are followed, I doubt that we could really identify them.

Second, there is the function of planning and management of a state system of child development, which means that there must be a plan and a system for management of a state system of child development. Now that is partially related to an internal management system. But it also means that whatever agency is responsible for the child development program, somebody must project, take the long-range look, direct where we are going, etc. in the services we render. And the kinds of things I hear do not necessarily indicate that. I see us project-oriented, piece-mealing it, going without data, going without developed products, and so on. I would contend that we do not have in place the kind of capability that will be required to deliver what we are talking about.

The third function is the planning and management of local systems of child development — the effort at each local level to plan and manage a program of child development. If you look at organizations, you will usually find the organization at the next level up is organizing to do the work of the organization at the next level down. You will rarely find an organization defining its work in terms of its responsibility. State departments of education never define the functions and work of state departments. They organize and work in terms of running schools, and we do not run a single school; we do not teach a single child. And yet what department of education does not have a division of curriculum and instruction? The job of the state department of education — and I use it only as an example of what is true for other organizations — is to direct the planning and management of local school systems. Its work is to lead the local school systems; that is where work is actually going to be accomplished.

If I look at the U.S. Office of Education, its organization (with all due apologies) becomes even more ridiculous. You will not find in the U.S. Office of Education, or any federal office or agency with which I have been related, any definition of functions that describes the primary responsibility that they should have to us as states. Can you find one agency that is defined and operated in terms of leading and assisting states to do the kind of things we are talking about? Invariably, they are organized in terms of actually teaching the handicapped child or the preschool child, and their interests are in individual projects spread across the country. Who is going to do the big job of helping me, as a state superintendent of schools, to build into school systems the kinds of things we are talking about? The same is true of offices of child development. What office is really organized and has defined functions in terms of helping local offices of child development? They are all talking and thinking and working in terms of individual projects instead of organizing in terms of helping the people who must do the work. I think this is most critical in the considerations before us and in the speculation on which agency should and should not be doing certain things.

The fourth function is based on the notion that we have developed the kind of organizational approach I am talking about. This function is the provision of technical services to what I call the process level of child development. That is, I have the responsibility and the function to put in place the kinds of technical services that are required by the people who are at the delivery level — the teaching level. I have a very difficult time finding among my staff people who can help in this way. I can find all sorts of people who can supervise and go out and help a superintendent plan and so on, but I cannot find anyone who, without asking any questions whatsoever, will walk in and say, "I am here and I will help you with your problem." That is technical assistance that I think is greatly needed.

The fifth and last function for us at a state level or federal level is the constant development of new practices and procedures in child development. This brings to the surface the great requirement of a strong research and development program, and we just do not have it anywhere. We are talking about things that are not proven; we cannot provide the complete directions for people to implement the programs we are talking about.

Burton White gave one of the best reports that you will ever hear in this field on research (see page). He does not go as far on development, although he makes strong implications for it. Development is an extension or use of the research data to produce programs that will achieve objectives we have in serving children. It is a tremendously tedious job. I used to live beside Union Carbide and watch its scientists try to develop a new gallon of antifreeze. The money they put into it and all the research data they had to go on made me sick when I compared it to my ability to produce a new product in education.

By this time, I have established in my state department of education a division of research and development that is greater than that in any other state department of education in this country. I have more money in it. And it is not difficult to do. Practically everything we do has, on the front end of it, resources for adequate research and development.

To introduce change, to produce new practices, I contend that you have to go outside the usual operational lines of an organization. For example, when the education of the handicapped became a responsibility of ours, I did not put it in the special education department because the department would simply have approached it in its usual way and added it to what was already going on. There is no other way it could do it. If you have the job of running something every day, you cannot stop it while you start something that demands about two or three times as much of your time. There is no way you can change the system by heaping more and more upon it. We have to move to a strong research and development capability, and we should keep a project in research and development until we know it will work. We cannot continue the process of just suggesting that we think something will work and handing it over to an agency. We need to test and prove it first.

These considerations seem to me to affect greatly how we organize to deliver services or implement programs of child development.

Families and Children: Why Do We Ignore Their Needs?

Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senator, Minnesota

I wish to speak, very briefly, about an old subject, but one I think we have taken for granted, namely the American family. I have been privileged to serve in the Senate now for just short of a decade, and I think I have served on as many or more human-problem subcommittees as any member of the Senate. During that time, I have been on the Hunger Committee, the manpower and poverty subcommittee, the children and youth subcommittee, the housing and urban development subcommittee, the Indian education subcommittee which has expired, the education subcommittee, the labor subcommittee and hosts of others. And, in each of them we tend to look at a category: are people hungry? or, do migrants get paid enough? or, do we have bilingual education for Chicanos, for Indians? or, are civil rights being observed? or, is the proper housing being built? All these are categories, and I suppose in a sense that is necessary. But the longer I look at this problem, the more obvious it is that the central focus must be on the family, because no matter how well we do in the delivery of public and private services, there is no adequate substitute for a healthy family. If our system puts undue pressure upon families, destroying them, making it difficult for them to do their task, then an indispensable and irreplaceable aspect of raising healthy children will be gone and irretrievable. I do not care where you look; there is no substitute for the family in terms of delivering to a child a sense of love, of support, of confidence, of self-worth, of motivation and self-respect. It is the family to which we must look for our key source of ethical and moral training in this country.

Urie Bronfenbrenner, testifying last year before our Senate subcommittee on children and youth, put it this way. He said, "It is no accident that in the million years of evolution we've emerged with a particular form for raising children, and that is the human family. We should be very careful in fiddling with something that has managed to do us well so long before we even had Ph.D.'s, like myself, in child development." I think few Americans would disagree with that statement; yet, American families have come under increasing pressures in recent decades. And I am afraid we are often better at paying lip service to the institution of the family and its importance than we are at actually helping them and pursuing policies that assist them to do a better job in their work.

A few years ago, following the White House Children's Conference in Washington, we set up a subcommittee on children and youth which, to my knowledge, is the first time that the Congress has had a subcommittee with a staff that seeks to provide a forum for young people and their problems. We tried not to begin with the experts, but to hear from families and what they have to say about the problems they confront. While I think most American families are strong and healthy, I think there are warning signs that should cause concern in America that we cannot ignore. Teen-age alcoholism and drug abuse are growing problems. Suicide is the second leading cause of death for young Americans between 15 and 24. One out of nine children will be before juvenile court by age 18. One million young Americans, most of them middle class, run away each year. And child abuse is a growing and widespread phenomenon in American life.

There are some problems that don't show up in the statistics. A few months ago I was at Cornell talking to a seminar on this same issue, and in the question-and-answer period someone stood up in the back of the room and said, "All right, senator, we understand the problems of poverty, but how would you like to grow up in a family where there is great wealth but you never see your father or your mother?" And, you could feel in that room that that was the issue which had affected most of that audience. You might call it the problems of prosperity where, as one of them said, the cocktail hour has replaced the family hour.

I think the message of this is pretty clear. We cannot ignore what is happening to American families, the pressure they are under, the problems they face and the changes that are taking place. Some of the problems that families face may be unavoidable, but we must also recognize that in a host of ways, often unwittingly, government policies are placing destructive burdens on our families. Now, I do not want a Big Brother government running American families. I do not think that is the government's business. But, I do believe the government ought to pursue a course that at the very least does not interfere or place burdens upon families in their efforts to raise healthy children. In many ways I think we have gone beyond that and are in fact interfering with and sometimes making it almost impossible for some families to do their jobs.

Look at current economic policies and the inflation that is now literally a torture for families of low and moderate income. We have rising unemployment, and every expert we have talked to says that when the head of the household cannot find a job or cannot earn enough to take care of the minimum necessities of a home, that household is in serious jeopardy. The pride, the sense of authority, the whole family structure breaks down, when the capacity of a family head to find a job and to pay for the cost of raising children decently does not exist. And yet, I would bet that when the Council of Economic Advisers or the Federal Reserve Board meets, the question of the family and the price it is paying for the twin policies of inflation and unemployment is seldom raised. Yet, in the long run, those costs may be in the hundreds of billions of dollars, just in direct economic cost.

Look at how we deal with our taxes. Take the Social Security payroll tax. That's a dandy. In the last 15 years, corporate and business taxes to the federal government have dropped by almost 40 per cent in terms of their contribution to the cost of maintaining the federal government. The individual income tax has remained about the same in terms of its percentage contribution to the cost of federal government. The payroll tax has doubled. The payroll tax is now a bigger tax for low- and moderate-income workers, in most instances, than the income tax. It is a flat tax; there are no exemptions, there are no deductions for the size of the family or for the cost of medicine or anything else. It is a flat, regressive tax. At those income levels approaching welfare, it is a tax that discourages work. And yet, that tax above all is the one that has been soaring.

Today when a low- or moderate-income family's salary rises to adjust to inflation, it just puts them into a higher tax bracket. So, not only are the dollars worth less, but they are being taxed more. And, I see little or no thought being given to the erosion of income and the devastating impact that these tax policies have today upon the family. A family earning $12,000 last year has to earn $13,300 this year simply to stay even. Of course, most of them have had no such increases, which is why the real purchasing power of families has dropped by nearly five per cent from last year. The real purchasing power of the average family today is actually lower than it was nine years ago.

Now, our economic and our tax policies are only one example of those policies that place pressures on families. Others that might also be included in the list are policies which unnecessarily encourage placement of children in foster homes or institutions, rather than offering families the support they need to stay together. Now, sometimes children have to be placed in those institutions, but I think many times the emphasis is on what someone called "parentectomy" rather than upon trying to provide help and strengthen that family.

Often, I think, our public housing and urban renewal policies have destroyed neighborhoods and communities or have been built in a way that is destructive to the family. Now, I am for public housing and I am for urban renewal, but I think those policies should be shaped sensitively, with the family in mind. And yet, I would bet, when the architects get together to plan one of those high-rises they never talk to a family who is going to live in one. If they ever did talk to such a family, they would never build those small kitchens. And if you talk to educators or social workers or anybody who has worked with families, they will tell you that the notion of packing a lot of very poor people together with all of their problems has proven to be a policy that has put unnecessary burdens on families.

And yet, some of those policies continue. For example, consider the policy in public housing of separating people on the basis of age. Here in Boston in 1900, 50 per cent of the families were three-generational in the same home. Now, four per cent are. In 1900, when a young couple reared their children, grandmother or grandfather or Aunt Susie was often around, or just down the block, and they could help a young couple with the problems of early marriage and young parenthood. Now, granny and grandfather are 18 miles away in a high-rise. That kind of support and strength that the family depended upon years ago is often gone for young couples.

Another example is the transfer policies of the armed services. We had as witnesses women who testified about what it is like to raise a family in the armed services. It is quite a story. They just keep moving them and moving them. And the divorce rate and the child-abuse rate show that the breakdown of families and the pressure in the armed services is not a very nice story.

Some of our day-care policies, especially those related to work requirements of Aid to Families With Dependent Children, have too often resulted in the placement of young children in understaffed, unlicensed custodial care of the worst kind. It is one of the reasons that I fought so hard for those minimum day-care standards. Some say they are unrealistic, but I am absolutely sure that unless you put some floor under minimum day-care standards, that the emphasis in implementation would be, let's save some money, let's "serve more children," or just, let's get those mothers out working, with little or no thought given to the welfare of the children. That, too, can destroy a family.

I am not sure that when we say in Washington that it is good for all mothers on welfare to work that we are doing the right thing either. You know, my mother stayed at home with me, and I kind of fell in love with her. I think this notion that it is always best under all circumstances to crowd people onto the payroll and take them away from their children in these tender years is a very, very questionable proposition. It is one that I think we will pay a lot more for in the long run, because I think children can be damaged in those custodial, understaffed programs. Parents ought to make those decisions, not governments.

There are many things we can do to begin to change this situation. One of the steps we hope to take shortly is to introduce a notion that I hope will do some good — a Family Impact Statement, like the Environmental Impact Statement — so that when we act on governmental programs we will be required to hold a hearing to ask if this will help families or weaken them. We need to find a way to introduce into our public debates this often-forgotten dimension of the relationship of governmental policies to families.

Second, I think we need to look at tax reform and tax justice in the context of the average family. You know, we are the only Western industrial society that does not have some kind of children's allowance policy. We have, of course, the tax exemption, and it is quite a deal. The richer you are, the more you get; the poorer you are (and you have to be working, of course, to even get it) the less you get. So that under this exemption, Henry Ford is able to add about $525 more a year per dependent to his meager budget, while the average worker is lucky to get $125 or $150 in real tax relief.

Now, one of the things that we tried, so far without success, was to close some of these loopholes through tax reform and then swing what we gain in revenue through this reform back into the hands of the average working family. We would do this in the form of an optional tax credit, an actual shaving-off of taxes, unrelated to your income. Our first proposal provided a choice between using a $200 credit per dependent or continuing to use the $750 personal exemption. Now, this would bring some relief — about $240 — for a family of four whose income is $8,000 a year. It would also bring more relief for large families.

We'd like to move away from exclusive reliance on the exemption system into a system that includes a tax credit option, based on the number of dependents in the family, that would really bring relief to families during the child-rearing era. I believe this is a form of relief that is long overdue.

We are also hoping to develop a bill to encourage wider experimentation with flexible working hours, so that parents can work on a schedule that is consistent with their family responsibilities, so they can develop their professional skills and increase their earning capacity while working in a way that they deem consistent with the needs of their children.

Finally, and most importantly, we need a program that offers families the kind of help and services they need for children during the early childhood years. A major part of this program must be an effort to upgrade child care available across the country. The facts in this area are well known, and there are dramatic changes under way. In 1971, 43 per cent of the nation's mothers worked outside the home compared to 18 per cent in 1948, and the number is rising. One out of every three mothers with preschool children is working today, compared to one out of eight in 1948. One out of seven children, some eight million, are living in single-parent families. That's an area that has not received sufficient attention. Many single-parent homes are having a great deal of difficulty, many of them living in near-poverty. Moreover, 65 per cent of single parents are working. Yet, there are only 700,000 spaces in licensed day care centers to serve six million preschool children, and many of those centers are in lousy shape. Ken Kenniston, director of the Carnegie Council on Children, said, "Of all the industrialized nations, we have the least adequate public provision for the care of young children whose mothers work." A child-care program must offer other needed services as well, including the kind of prenatal and postnatal health care that will help us reduce our inexcusably high infant mortality rate.

It is indefensible the way the federal government has failed to deal with the problems of children's health. For a modest investment we could make some dramatic changes in this area. Early childhood is a time when parents and children are most in need of proper care. They need it during the time of the mother's pregnancy; they need it at the time of the delivery; they need it during those first few years after birth. And yet, that is the time when millions of people get absolutely no care whatsoever. I remember holding some hearings in migrant health down in southern Texas where a Field Foundation team of doctors had just tried to conduct what they thought was going to be a scientific survey. But they found so many sick people that they dropped the survey and just worked to try to save lives. Something like 60 or 70 per cent of the migrant mothers deliver their children with no professional care. There are other statistics utterly devastating. And yet, for a few dollars, their health needs could be dealt with and they would rear healthy children who could care for themselves instead of ending up as so many of them do, crippled, cheated children, many of them destined for welfare for the rest of their lives.

We must have part-day or in-the-home preschool educational opportunities that can make the difference between success or failure in school and life. We need to continue to work on nutrition and mental health services, classes in parenthood and all the rest.

One of the things we hope to do is to start again to move for the passage of a child and family services bill. This is, as you know, the measure which we introduced and passed overwhelmingly in the Senate and the House and which was then vetoed by President Nixon in 1971. I re-introduced a revised version of the measure this past July, with 23 sponsors in the Senate. Representative John Brademas introduced the companion measure in the House with 50 cosponsors, and next week we begin joint House-Senate hearings in Washington. This bill authorizes $1.8 billion over the next three years to provide a wide range of child and family services. I believe you are probably familiar with the measure. It is totally voluntary. It maximizes parental control in decision making. It has a unique phase-in year for planning and training. And it seeks to serve a broad range of economic groups, with free services to families with incomes below $8,100 and a graduated-fee schedule for families with incomes above that level.

Now this measure is not etched in stone. We want to use this remaining period and the early part of the next Congress for hearings. We are soliciting your suggestions and advice. One of the areas that has caused a great deal of controversy is the manner in which we propose to deliver services. We would appreciate suggestions about that point or any others. I am increasingly convinced that progress can be made in this area; but it can be made only if we define what it is we want, if we make a more powerful and effective case than we have, if we establish lobbies at the local and at the state and federal levels, and if we make justice for children an issue with which the political system must grapple as a priority question.

I believe that can be done. I think this country has shown time and time again that there is enormous honesty and compassion and sense of personal responsibility in Americans. And above all, Americans want to respond to the plea for fairness and justice for children. For, as the French philosopher Camus once wrote, "Perhaps we cannot prevent this world from being a world in which children are tortured, but we can reduce the number of tortured children." And, if you don't help us, who else in the world can help us do it?

Organizing to Deliver Services: The Public School System

Moderator
Barbara Finberg
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Panel
Bettye Caldwell
Center for Early Development and Education, University of Arkansas

James Gallagher
Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina

Donald Pierson
Brookline Early Education Project, Massachusetts

Barbara Finberg: The subject of this panel is implementing child development programs with and through the public school systems. As Burton White outlined so well for us earlier, the foundations for children's physical, social, emotional and intellectual development are laid in the first six years of a child's life. He spoke about language development, about the development of curiosity, about social development and about the foundations of intelligence. We entrust the raising of our children, rightfully, to their parents; but, for this major task of helping little people make sense out of the world and cope with it, we rely chiefly on instinct, what parents may remember of their own childhood and what some parents may learn from other parents.

We do not have in the United States any institution that is universally available and geared to the unique qualities of the family and the child, between birth and 6 years of age. The medical system, if we can call it a system, attends most mothers at birth and may provide immunizations, but after that usually sees parents and children only when something has gone wrong. Not until a child is 5 or 6 does he or she enter the public school system, which is nearly universal.

But, by that time, five or six most important years have already gone by. Thinking about this lack of program, or any program that is available to all parents and children, some persons began to ask if there was some way that the schools could provide assistance, information, support and encouragement to parents and their children in the earliest years. Three persons who are exploring what such a program might look like and whether it is feasible are the members of this panel. They direct three very different programs, each engaged with infants and young children and their parents, each closely integrated with the elementary schools that the children will later attend.

• • •

Bettye Caldwell: It is interesting to note how the term "child development" has soared to popularity in the last few years. In the disciplinary organization of colleges and universities, it used to get lost or driven out, often finding refuge in a nurtural college of home economics or living in limbo between departments in colleges. But suddenly the term is "in," and what it stands for is "in." As a consequence, some of those people in psychology are actually eating lunch with those "home ec" types, suggesting joint teaching of courses and possibly even some sharing of that ever-scarcer commodity, students.

To some extent, the term has even invaded the world of the public school, although to a significantly less degree. Many high schools now offer some sort of course in child development as part of a pre-parent or parent education. And, of course, far more public schools are now in the business of early childhood education than was the case a few years ago, operating programs under Title I of ESEA or perhaps with Model Cities money and occasionally even with locally appropriated funds. However, I know of precious few schools that describe themselves as operating child *development* programs or that describe their schools for students of any age as child development centers.

For purposes of our discussion, I am going to define child development services as a broad array of support systems to the child and the family that will facilitate the cumulative progression through life, the acquisition of competencies and attitudes that at any and all points in the life cycle enable the child to feel of consequence to himself and to others. The need for such services is probably inversely related to the age of the child, but the need remains throughout childhood. And if we were to broaden our term and speak here of human, rather than child, development, obviously we would recognize that the need remains throughout life.

For five years I have had the good fortune of being associated with an effort to demonstrate that a full array of child development programs can be centered in an elementary school. (This effort was funded from 1969 to 1974 through the U.S. Office of Child Development (OCD) and is now funded in part by Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, partly by the Little Rock School District and partly by grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller

Brothers Fund.) It is my personal conviction that the elementary school is the only delivery system with anything like the universal reach needed for child development programs throughout the country, though that point of view is obviously open to debate. I would like to describe to you some of the major components of this program, offer a brief critique of how well or how poorly we feel these components have worked, discuss what I see as some of the major problems that we encountered and some that we overlooked, and offer a few suggestions to the hardy among you who would go out and do likewise.

First of all, we established an early childhood education program for children down to 6 months of age using empty classrooms in a public school. The school itself, prior to the launching of the project, was a regular Little Rock School District elementary school called Kramer, and the project became known as "the Kramer Project." Now, the aim of this arrangement was to permit continuity of development from the preschool years right through the elementary years. The Westinghouse Study and data from other early intervention projects had shown that cognitive and social gains could be facilitated through quality early childhood programs, but that these gains were often lost or attenuated after the children reached the elementary years. Our goal was to create, with the help of the school and the home, a supportive environment that would provide the experiences young children need to develop optimally during this period. Then, we hoped to facilitate whatever adaptations were necessary at the elementary level to move the child development approach upward into the elementary school.

Second, we changed the entire school into an extended day school, open from 6:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m., thus providing day care within the same facility that provided education. To make a distinction between education and day care is, to me, patently ridiculous. It is an exercise in professional discipline protection that certainly does not deserve to be associated with anything that we call a child development approach. This part of our venture has gone beautifully. In fact, it is perhaps the one child development service most closely associated with the project's identity.

Until June 1974, all of the extra components of the Kramer model were funded by the OCD grant. Beginning in September of 1974, the day care service, both preschool and elementary, will be operating with funds from Title IV-A of the Social Security Act. This will be the first time in the state of Arkansas that a local school district will be a contractor for a IV-A program. We do not know if this has been done in other states, but I think people in other states should be reminded of the possibility of this means of collaboratively funding early childhood programs.

Third, we developed a framework of cooperation between a university and a local school district. An advisory board to oversee the project consisted of representatives from the university, senior-level research staff from the project itself and personnel from the Little Rock School District. During the five years of the project, our institutional identification has drifted away from the university and toward the school district. Quite a bit of time was required in the early stages of the project for the development of basic trust in the staff. That trust was made concrete and tangible two years ago when I, the director of the project, was made principal of the project school. That act further unified our administrative structure and immeasurably strengthened the clout of the project ideas with the elementary teachers and with the parents in the community.

Fourth, we tried to involve the families in all aspects of the project. One of our originally stated objectives was to make the school into a community school, one that the families could use for all kinds of extra school activities, one in which they would feel they truly had input. We have had group activities, discussion groups for parents of children with problems, social services to parents in their homes, home tutoring and so on. Within our particular framework, this has consistently been the most difficult objective to achieve, however. Most of our parents work and their leftover time and energy are in short supply. Nevertheless, when it looked as though we were going to run out of money this spring, our parents were our biggest boosters and repeatedly volunteered their help to make certain that the Kramer Project did not close.

Fifth, we have demonstrated that research and development can comfortably occur within a public school setting. By working very hard at avoiding a schism between teachers and researchers, we avoided the usual situations where the teachers are suspicious of "those researchers who are doing research on us." I heartily recommend one simple technique that we used. All researchers were required to spend some time working directly with the children, at recess or lunch time when the children tend to be wild and obstreperous and difficult to control or when a teacher needed to be excused for a parent conference or early in the morning when many children arrive at once, for example. It is a great way to develop empathy between researchers and teachers. We have had some stormy times in this area. Sometimes the researchers did not want to do it or claimed that they lacked the authority needed to back them up in these kinds of activities, but we have weathered those storms and the research has gone on. It is indeed possible for research to live comfortably within the setting of the public school if you integrate it with the regular school activity and do not permit it to be viewed as something that goes on outside.

Sixth, we tried to develop a sensitive health program for the school. This was essentially a failure. We, ourselves, eliminated it from the program rather than endorse an insensitive delivery system. We worked for the better part of a year trying to catalyze the development of a clinic on the premises and to obtain pediatric aid to help us make decisions about when a child needed more serious medical attention. But when the service began, we on the project staff assessed it as being as insensitive as other kinds of medical services already available to the parents. We had assigned a precious and much-needed classroom to it and, since it did not seem to meet the needs of the families, we decided to terminate it. Next year, we hope to have a nurse-practitioner as part of our staff, half time, and we will see how that goes.

Finally, we have reorganized the student-teaching experience for the teaching interns to feature a developmental approach, the unique thing we feel we have to give to prospective teachers. No matter what age-level a student teacher might give as an eventual professional objective, we have him or her spend some time with children in all the groups in the school. We also require contact with families as part of the training experience. Next year, we will have students involved with the children as part of their preprofessional training. We would like to be able to offer an extra year of training as a true internship and hope to add this to our program in the near future.

Now to conclude with some problems we have encountered and some recommendations. Our biggest problem has been just what you would expect — money. One cannot expect a school district to add these extra developmental services without some extra financial support. Our project was funded as a five-year research project; but by about the middle of our five years, we no longer fit the OCD research priorities. We had some anxious times in there. Furthermore, a large part of our budget went for the Early Childhood Program that was regarded as service and totally apart from the research that was contingent upon that program. And we heard rumblings that the project was too expensive to continue. We remain, incidentally, eternally grateful to OCD for letting us stay alive for our first five years. But, five years is not long enough to test out the effectiveness of this kind of project. It is not even long enough to get the kinks out of the procedure.

Let me share with you some of the pearls of wisdom that I pass out freely to people these days. The top one on the list is: it is a lot harder to implement an idea than it is to generate that idea in the first place. It is easy to spin ideas, to conceptualize what you want to do. But when you try to put it into practice, you are going to break your back. You are going to be up against it all the time trying to think of new ways of dealing with the problems that come up, problems that you literally cannot anticipate until you are there in the real world of the educational system. I would say, however, we must not give up just because it is difficult.

Our second biggest problem has been one of administration. The project was essentially an administrative intrusion into an already bureaucratically burdened system. Our OCD grant went to the university where I had a faculty appointment, which meant that all the preschool teachers were university employees and all the elementary teachers were school district employees. I had clear lines of authority with all project personnel, but the elementary teachers and the school principal had other traditional channels of authority that were real and important. This presented quite a problem which I think we did not perceive for about two years of operation, and it remained a problem until I was made principal of the school. As I look back on that situation in retrospect, I find it almost incredible that we did not anticipate that problem. If we could do it over again, I would have the money go directly to the school district. That helps more than anything to create a feeling of identity with the project. University involvement could still be sought and encouraged. A number of our big city school districts have research and development offices, and many smaller communities have enough local talent available to permit such innovative arrangements.

The last problem I want to mention relates to the personnel factor in a venture such as this. Reams have been written about the process of change, forces that resist change, forces that facilitate change. S. B. Sarason has written in his book, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, an absorbing case history of the attempts of a group of highly educated consultants to produce changes in teacher behavior and the school climate. He concludes essentially, that the more things change, the more they are the same. He also cautions that you cannot change the schools from outside the system. V. F. Haubrich has charged (in "Does the commonschool have a chance?" *Freedom Bureaucracy and Schooling*, V. F. Haubrich, ed.) that we have a system of education that has an enormous capacity to absorb change while not changing at all. The litanies about how the education bureaucracy resists change are many.

We do face something of that paradox when we talk about changing schools to make them more sensitive to the developmental needs of children. In this panel discussion, we are raising this specifically as a question: Can the schools really provide child development services? This implies that schools are not already offering such services. Such implications automatically elicit defensiveness on the part of the public school establishment.

There used to be an old joke that claimed that no one had the right to criticize psychoanalysis until one had been psychoanalyzed, by which time he or she would be so brainwashed he could no longer see anything wrong with the system. Right now I am in something of the condition of the psychoanalyzed patient. That is, I have metamorphosed into a public school person, so those stones that are thrown hurt me now. They seem to hit me much more personally. I do not want to think that five years ago I walked into Kramer school and said in effect, "Hey, you insensitive teachers and administrators, I'm here to help you humanize your program and change this expletivedeleted old traditional school into a swingin' place with what we 'in' people call the child development orientation." Really, I did not say that, but I probably suggested those attitudes.

So, my final suggestion to those who might want to try some part of our experience is that, whatever you do, avoid that mistake. Remind the public school people that they are already speaking prose. Remind them that apart from a few private schools and health services and programs like Head Start, they might be the only people in the community offering a variety of child development services. Then, find out what resources they feel they need to elaborate and help them extend those services. Find out what kinds of help they can accept from you and other groups in the community. If you are willing to do that, I predict that the public schools, our only delivery system with the possibility of universal reach, will indeed reach out to help.

• • •

James Gallagher: My three-year sojourn in the government in Washington convinced me that the biggest missing ingredient in our business is the effective interaction of the public policymaker and the professionals in the field. The professionals need to nurture those public policymakers of all political persuasions who are interested in human beings. It is not just a matter that the children don't vote; children don't contribute to election campaigns either! If the first law of politics is survival, we need to see to it that those politicians particularly interested in programs to help human beings are in fact able to survive as well as those politicians who are interested in "things." "Things" (i.e. dams, defense contracts) bring big money into the local district as a reward. The question we have to address is, how can we reward those people who, out of their own personal convictions as much as their own profit, are trying to help our programs?

There is a story attributed to Mark Twain that involves a physician who went to his just rewards and approached the Pearly Gates. The archangel in charge went over the big book and said, "You've lived an exemplary life and, as a matter of fact, it has been so exemplary that we are able to give you any special wish that you might want to have. Do you have such a request?" The physician said, "Yes, I do. All my life I've wanted to have a chance to meet the greatest physician that has ever lived in the world." The archangel said, "I think we can deal with that. Come over here to this corner." The physician went over and looked, and he was very surprised. "But, I know that man," he said. "He wasn't a doctor. He was just a cobbler in my town." The archangel turned to him and said, "Yes, but if he *had* been a physician, he would have been the greatest physician in the world."

Let me discuss the work of the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center (FPG Center). It was originally established in 1966 by Hal Robinson and Nancy Robinson, a very effective team of psychologists. The FPG Center is multidisciplinary, with 16 senior staff people who have appointments in various departments of the University of North Carolina.

There are two major sets of questions that the center tries to address. One of these is, what makes a competent, developing human being? We know that a young child must develop effective physical, social, cognitive, language and motor skills. We know that all of these developmental channels interact with one another. We know that the antecedents of later behavior are often hidden in a complex network of early experiences. And we know the difficulty of trying to figure out what children are like by working backwards from adult life and perspective. So, one of the tasks that we are engaged in most intensively is the attempt to observe and help a youngster's development from the earliest possible time.

One of our major projects now under way is an intensive program to try to stimulate the developmental competencies of a group of "high-risk" children — high risk being determined by the kind of family situation the youngsters find themselves in. We start as early as three months, working with the children and with their parents to try to defeat that prediction of high risk. In a nine-hour day care program, we provide stimulation in the field of language development, in the areas of motivation and contingent reinforcement to convince the youngster that the world is a predictable place in which he or she can be an effective person. We have pediatricians who are working on research in the early development of pulmonary defenses against infection in youngsters. We have people working in the area of psycholinguistic studies and in the early development of language, of cognitive style and of the family dimensions that are particularly relevant to the early development of youngsters.

We are committed to the notion of longitudinal research and to the notion that if you really want to understand children, it is better to study 20 or 25 children intensively over time than to look at 300 children once or twice with the aid of standard observations or tests.

Because longitudinal development is not linear and not easy to predict, one has to follow the various twists and turns that early development takes in order to understand which forces are really crucial to that early development and which forces are merely complementary to it. In relation to this concern, we are beginning a major curriculum development effort. We will try to bring the best that we know from theory and the best that we know from practical experience and put them into some kind of a blend to create a sequential developmental curriculum that can be used by anyone who is working on developmental skills, whether that person is in a day care center, a home visitor program or some kind of school setting.

Now, the second major question that we're most interested in at the Frank Porter Graham Center is how to bring knowledge to the practicing professional. To do this, we're involved in two large technical assistance programs. The first of these is called TADS (Technical Assistance Development System), a service program to a nationwide group of a hundred centers sponsoring early childhood demonstration programs for preschool handicapped children. We try to work with each of the centers on the problems that they identify as the most important to them. I agree with Ms. Caldwell that you have to start where the people are and the problems that they are concerned with, if you are going to do them any good. So we are working directly with those centers to help them in fields such as program planning, evaluation, curriculum development — whatever aspect they feel needs strengthening in their demonstration program.

The second area of technical assistance is the Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System designed to assist the state developmental disability councils established by law to do long-range planning for children with developmental disabilities. Many of these state councils lack expertise in certain technical areas, and our responsibility is to help each of these councils in those areas where they feel they need special assistance. We have just established a third program in cooperation with the University of Kentucky and George Washington University to provide help on a regional basis in Maryland, Virginia, District of Columbia, North Carolina, West Virginia, Delaware, Tennessee and Kentucky. We offer special assistance for programs with handicapped children in that area, with particular emphasis on early childhood and in program planning.

One of the distinctive features about this last arrangement is our unusual compact with the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Schools to exchange land and buildings. We are, therefore, on the physical site of a public school building. We have a cooperative arrangement that includes, among other things, the cooperative running of an open education, multi-age kindergarten for 60 youngsters on the first floor of our building. We also participate in a variety of research projects involving the school, including studies of the impact of open education on the behavior of certain children.

I approach the problem of how well the schools operate and what the schools' participation should be in early childhood from a consistent standpoint. If you ask are the schools ready to incorporate new early childhood programs, my answer is "No." Can they be? The answer is, in my view, "Yes." We have already demonstrated that it is possible for the schools to expand and extend their responsibilities and take on responsibilities that 10 or 15 years ago we thought they were not able to do. For example, in one area of handicapped children, they have brought in many different professions that the schools had never really dealt with extensively before. Over half of the states now have legislation that either permits or mandates programs for handicapped children beginning before the entrance of school age, and many of the states are actively developing programs connected with the schools for youngsters down to age 1, 2 and 3, who are deaf or have cerebral palsy, who have a variety of handicapping conditions. We are following the very good child development principle that the earlier you start, the more effective your programs are going to be.

It is very easy to get frustrated with bureaucracies, and it is very hard to change them. One of the questions that we have to ask ourselves is, if we are not going to try to reform the schools, what is the alternative? The alternative is setting up some kind of a separate bureaucratic system. You cannot compare the bureaucratic complexities of an organization that is trying to take care of fifty million children in the United States with small excellent demonstration programs that are providing services to a small group of young children. One fact that is overwhelming to me is that if you walk down the street of your city and you pass 100 people, by the law of averages one of those is going to be an elementary or secondary school teacher. There are about two million elementary and secondary school teachers in this country; 1.2 million of that number are elementary school teachers. That is a lot of people; that is a lot of jobs to fill with competent, exciting and dynamic people. Sometimes the jobs have to be filled whether or not you have an exciting, dynamic person.

The question is not, can I run one or two brilliant demonstrations to show what I can do with children? The real trick is to extend that kind of service over large numbers of children. To contemplate an alternative system to education and the schools means contemplating not just working with 10 or 20 professionals, but setting up a vast new system of thousands of professionals. The schools have the advantage of the physical plant, they have the advantage of public fiscal support.

When I was in the federal government, the federal government was contributing six cents on the dollar to the total costs of education. The long-range plans that I have seen assume that that amount will go up to 20 per cent or 25 per cent sometime in the next 10, 15 or 20 years. I think that that is reasonable. That will provide the fiscal support that will be necessary to do the kinds of jobs that we want the school system to do. I do not think it is necessary that all of the exciting things take place in the schools; as a matter of fact, sometimes it is easier to do exciting new things outside the boundaries of the schools. But, the schools will see them, they will take note of them and they will incorporate them, slowly and perhaps too slowly for some of us, but they will do it.

Let me make one point about research. One of the things that became clearer as we tried to look at the 1-, 2-, and 3-year-olds, is that we know next to nothing about the integrated and sequential development of youngsters in that age period. All we have is the accumulated experience of experts who observe intelligently and give you their best judgment on what they think is happening. That is good, but it is not good enough.

Take the state of North Carolina; less than one-half of one per cent of the money allotted for day care or for education goes toward research, toward trying to find out how to do the job better. Somebody in Washington once told me, "If you want to know what is really going on, don't pay attention to the rhetoric; go to the budget and find out where the money is being spent. That is what tells you what is really going on."

So we have people complaining that the school systems are not doing their job, that day care is not doing its job, yet we are spending less than one penny out of every dollar trying to find new and better ways as to how to do it. If you are seriously concerned about child development and early education, then why not put the same amount of money into this field as we now put into medicine and agriculture and business. If we spent as little money on tobacco research in North Carolina as on education, the tobacco farmer would be out of business in 10 years. If we put as little money into research and development in General Motors as we put in education or day care or child development research, they would be out of business in 10 years. Businesses know what works; they know that if you make a major investment in finding systematic ways to do the job better, you get payoff from it. That is something we have not learned in the field of human resources and that we have not committed ourselves to.

• • •

Donald Pierson: The Brookline Early Education Project (BEEP) has been in operation on a pilot basis for about a year and a half. It operates as part of the Brookline Public Schools. It is funded for the first two years of operation by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. Our purpose is to determine the benefits of providing comprehensive, diagnostic and education services to families beginning before the birth of their child and continuing through to the entry of public school kindergarten. We are presently providing services to 262 families who have had infants born since March 1973 or were expecting before the end of September 1974. The program is open to all residents of Brookline, as well as to black and Spanish-speaking residents of Boston. In recalling the experiences of a year and a half, I made a list of about a dozen inter-related and overlapping considerations. These considerations may help others who are planning to start similar programs.

The first consideration is that despite the years of planning that went into the BEEP operation, the involvement of many school personnel, the creative ideas of Burton White, the involvement of medical personnel and the involvement of community personnel, there has been much to learn in moving from planning to implementation. The day-to-day operation of being involved with a wide range of families can only be learned by trying; the preliminary planning is never entirely adequate.

A second consideration is the question of grandeur versus gradualism. In moving toward a comprehensive early childhood program, you need to consider whether to implement multiple dimensions at once for as large a group as possible at the beginning or whether to try to move in successive phases with preliminary planning, pilot studies and staff training. There are many arguments on both sides. I would characterize our approach as being slightly more toward gradualism. We are starting only with newborns, instead of taking children throughout the prekindergarten years. We are starting on a pilot basis, limiting the total group to about 285 families. A rule of thumb we have tried to follow is not to do anything unless we can do it well. We continually reexamine our total staff capacity before starting up a new program. For instance, one of the compromises that we made in starting out was to start with just one neighborhood center, to run that well and to consolidate our staff there. In the process, we have provided more free transportation for parents to help them get to the center than would otherwise have been necessary, but our decision was to start with one demonstration center and to move out from there.

I see two important risks in the gradualism approach. One is the need for continuity of funding to complete the pilot phase and move toward the total operational phase. It is unrealistic to expect public schools to commit enough funds at the outset to move completely in this direction. A second risk is introduced when the process of planning is extended over too many years; the individuals initially involved may leave and those who follow may not have either the same aims or the necessary zeal and commitment. So there are two sides to the question of scale.

A third consideration is staff selection. In selecting staff who will be working closely with parents, we feel that the academic credentials are often not as important as empathy with parents. We have felt so strongly about this requirement during the infancy phase of our program that we have required that teaching staff have not only a background in child development and experience in working in the field, but that they also be parents themselves.

Another factor we emphasize in staff selection is the fact that the values, the racial and ethnic mix of the staff, as well as their language background, should reflect that of the participating families.

Another concern, overlapping with staff selection, is the style of support that staff can give to families. The rhetoric that we use among our staff is that we see ourselves as "resource persons" rather than as "experts" in working with families. We see our teacher-home visitor role as one of being able to brainstorm with parents, to help parents come up with additional ideas, insights and options about ways in which they can gain new confidence and enjoyment in working with their children. We feel that there is a significant risk, in sending someone into the home or in meeting with parents, of undermining the parents' confidence in their role. We have to be careful not to introduce new anxieties about their competence and especially not to aggravate the anxiety about school achievement that many parents feel when their children reach age 5 or 6, and some parents feel when their babies are still newborns.

Another area also related to staff considerations and staff development is the kind of staff support and quality control that one builds into the program. It is very important to try to set a nonthreatening, collaborative tone in which staff members work as a team, in which they feel that they have something to offer as well as to gain from being open about the way in which they opererate with other staff members. The team approach assumes two or more heads might be better than one in planning a program. If we don't follow this approach, I think we risk creating a situation where everyone declares, we do "what's good for kids," yet that might mean very different things to different people. Since I do not think any of us are ultimate authorities on what is good for kids, I think one way of being more assured that we are offering the best possible program for children and their families is to rely on more than one person in that contact with families.

A sixth consideration for our program has been how to involve families in the program—our recruiting efforts. This is an area that has taken much more of my efforts and of our total staff efforts than we initially anticipated. By having the program open to all residents of the community of Brookline as well as to all black and Spanish-speaking residents of Boston, we knew that education-oriented families would quickly seek us out as soon as there was any local publicity. But our requirement of attempting to recruit families prenatally, before the child is born, has made it even more difficult to seek out families who are not education-oriented, who are not likely to recognize the needs for support until perhaps the child is a few months or even years old. Their expectations and feelings of need may be very different from those of the professionals. So we have invested a great deal of our effort in recruiting these families and have been very fortunate in gaining the help of community agencies and schools, obstetricians and pediatricians in the community in referring families to us.

We have felt that it has been important to us to continue to attempt to recruit prenatally because this has offered us an opportunity to build rapport with families in a nonthreatening way, to offer families an opportunity to develop a clear understanding of what our program has to offer, to realize that it is not a substitute for day care, that it is not a substitute for their ongoing medical care, but that we intend to work closely with their public health center or pediatrician in providing that. If you are planning to start a program that begins before birth or as early in one child's life as possible, I would urge you to spend time building your contacts with people in the community to ensure that families who might need the services most will be participating from the outset. I might add that our most effective recruiters, by far, have been the families who began participating early in the program and had children born during the spring and summer of 1973. We continued to have difficulties recruiting until these families gained enough experience so that they could convey to others not only how valuable and important they found the program, but how much they enjoyed coming over to the BEEP center and being with their friends, just playing in the play room with their children or with staff. We really have not had to urge parents to go out and sell the program to other expectant parents because they have done it themselves. It takes patience and time, and our recruiting period has extended longer than we had initially anticipated, but I think that is because we needed to build confidence in the community first.

Another need is for interdisciplinary collaboration. We have felt from the outset that the medical input, in particular, is very important in helping children gain an optimum start in life. We have felt that pediatricians have a great deal to learn from educators and educators have a great deal to learn from pediatricians. Our collaboration with pediatricians from Children's Hospital Medical Center here in Boston has been very gratifying. They have worked very closely with us in planning the health and developmental exams, and they have come to realize the gap in their own training. Particularly during infancy and increasingly into the elementary school years, parents rely on their pediatrician and public health center for advice with regard to their child's learning ability and style. Yet pediatricians tend to have very little or no training in child development and their advice is sought solely because of their special position of expertise within the community rather than any special expertise in child development. Consequently, we have found the pediatricians with whom we are working to be particularly interested in gaining more insight into child development. In addition, because we do not provide total health care, the collaboration of our pediatricians has been very helpful in developing a close working relationship with the family's pediatrician and with area back-up agencies.

The importance of parent participation in program planning and policy issues is an area that I think is beyond dispute. You have to gain the participation of the parents in order to make sure that your program is responsive to their needs. But you have to keep in mind that sometimes the parents who are first to be involved in the planning, who volunteer for committees and who can be available for the daytime meetings, which are most convenient for staff members, may not be the most representative parents of your group. It is important to try to achieve parent involvement through many different channels of communication. For instance, we have a newsletter, a suggestion box and opportunities for frequent informal gatherings. There are tie-dye sessions or toy-making sessions that are often mainly just a social excuse for parents to get together, but which often serve as a starting point for a new direction of parent involvement and policy planning.

Here, briefly, are some final considerations. Keep in mind the truth-telling issue—the need to help parents be as well informed as possible about their child's pattern of health and developement and, at the same time, the need not to raise unnecessary anxieties by, for instance, giving them very soft medical information that has unknown prognostic significance. This is an ethical issue that has consumed a great deal of our time.

Also keep in mind the need for documentation and evaluation: documentation because the paper model often evolves to be something very different when the model is in operation. I think that extensive record-keeping can help keep one on the track.

Finally, I would submit that one continually needs the unwavering support of the administration within the schools. We have felt that it is important for school personnel to view BEEP as a school program. Consequently, we have taken much effort to involve school principals, curriculum directors and elementary school teachers in planning the program. In Brookline, the superintendent of school, Robert Sperber, regards BEEP as his most important professional endeavor to date. Moreover, it helps immensely to have the collaboration of key school people in working through and around the very frustrating mechanisms of the Civil Service bureaucracy.

Day Care and Cost Effectiveness: A National Overview and a Case Study

Moderator
John Niemeyer, President Emeritus, Bank Street College of Education, and President, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.

Panel
Richard Ruopp, Vice President, Human Development Area, Abt Associates, Inc., and Director of the National Day Care Study 1974-77 for the U.S. Office of Child Development

Mary Rowe, Special Assistant to the President and Chancellor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Irma Garay, Director, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, New York City

Gardenia White, Training Consultant, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, New York City

Jacqueline Monthe, Member of the Classroom Staff, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, New York City

John Niemeyer: In tackling the question of costs, we are going to take two approaches. First we will start with Mary Rowe and Richard Ruopp, who have been working on day care cost accounting, in terms of quality and program. Then, in addition to this broad approach to the topic, we will try to relate the question of costs to the services and program of a particular day care center — the Children's Pump House Center in New York City. I am always troubled by the fact that in meetings like these we talk about such topics as costs and programs and delivery systems, and yet many in this audience, particularly those who are devoting all their efforts to state legislation, may have never seen a day care center. Our purpose, then, is to give a human and realistic dimension to these abstract topics.

So we will turn first to Mr. Ruopp and Ms. Rowe for an overall view of costing, and then to the director of the Pump House Center, Irma Garay, and to two members of her staff, to discuss exactly how an actual center is organized and run to provide support to children and their families.

• • •

Richard Ruopp: Mary Rowe and I are going to focus our remarks primarily on full day care for preschool children. While we are not excluding after-school day care, and other kinds of part-time day care, the core issue is providing care for children of a working parent, or working parents, for the full course of their employment, whether it be nine-to-five or swing-shift or even graveyard shifts. That means approximately 2,250 hours of care for a child during a year, roughly 30 per cent more time than children spend each year in public education. The magnitude of the issue is large. Depending on whose estimates in 1974 you are looking at, there are probably 3.2 million to 3.5 million children under 6 years of age whose mothers or parents are employed full-time. Probably only 50 per cent to 60 per cent of those 3.2 million children are cared for by unpaid neighbors, aunts, uncles or other extended-family members. Probably about 30 per cent are in some kind of formal, paid-for, child care arrangement; roughly two-thirds of this latter group are in day care homes, and the other third receive care in centers. In addition, 3 per cent to 5 per cent of the children in that age group continue to be left on their own during the course of the day.

Thus, there is a large number of children for whom we are already spending large amounts of money. The 1974 fiscal federal obligations for all forms of early child care amount to slightly over $1 billion. The IRS estimates child care deductions at another billion, although that's a somewhat debatable figure. So, approximately $2 billion in federal funds, plus state Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) matching and Work Incentive Program (WIN) funds, probably brings it up closer to $3 billion in current public expenditures alone. In addition, there are large amounts of parent expenditures.

For the purpose of this discussion, we see day care as serving four groups. First, it certainly serves parents. Good day care that takes care of children during a parent's working time meets an essential need of an important segment of the population. Second, it serves children during the hours that they are not tended to by their parents or parent surrogates. Third, it serves staff members (an issue that often goes unnoticed) in terms of employment and in terms of the quality of staff life. And fourth, it serves the community by meeting a public responsibility for caring for the children of the population as a whole. As a parent who has used child care, as a quasi-staff member in the day care area and as a member of the community, I see all those needs as critical. I will say my bias is in favor of the children; so when we are talking about costs, it is clear that children come first, costs come second.

Day care, as we said, serves children through home care, through center care, through babysitters and through extended families. Over the last eight years, considerable controversy has developed. Essentially, four camps have grown up in the world surrounding day care policy. There is the "cost reduction" camp that suggests we should spend zero dollars annually on day care, that the place for children is in the home being cared for by a parent, preferably a woman. There is the "universal day care" notion, that advocates free or nearly free care for anybody who wants it in the United States, which according to Mary Rowe's last estimate would add an extra $40 billion a year to the national budget. And there are, if you will, the "perfect day care for some children" advocates who believe we should spend $5,000 a year for each child even if we serve only 50,000 children, making sure that each child gets every possible advantage during the course of a day care experience.

All of us, at various times, tend to be advocates of one or more of these four positions, depending on the political climate, the availability of funds and so on. But I believe that, from a public policymaker's point of view, it is reasonable to talk about the greatest good for the greatest number of families, within available budgets. Now Ms. Rowe will address some of the issues of cost analysis connected with this fourth view of public policy in day care.

• • •

Mary Rowe: Anybody who lives in Mr. Ruopp's camp 4 — that is, who wants to serve as many children as possible as well as possible with budgets that depend on other priorities — sooner or later comes to wish that we could do a traditional, classic cost-benefit analysis that would prove once and for all that programs for children are worthwhile. Because this question comes up so frequently, let me speak for a moment about why such an analysis cannot easily be used to justify children's programs.

The traditional analysis, ideally done, would look rather like this: First, it would be a long-term as well as a short-term analysis. But for many reasons, it is extremely difficult to demonstrate long-term benefits from children's programs. Perhaps the most important reason is just that such programs comprise only part of the inputs to a child's life and you are therefore testing variance in a small theme. In fact, of course, you cannot demonstrate the long-term benefits of any kind of education very well. We would not have public schools if we insisted on that philosophy.

Another major reason it is difficult to do the traditional analysis is that a good cost-benefit analysis must reckon damages as well as benefits to large populations. Most cost-benefit analyses that have been attempted with children's programs deal only with benefits or only with damages, but not with both together. Another major problem is that researchers fail to specify which population they are evaluating for benefits. Ordinarily, people look only at the benefits or damages to children, ignoring what happens to parents, staff and community. On the other hand, the Nixonian approach looks only at benefits to the community, leaving out benefits to children and parents, if any. It is difficult, but it would be necessary, in a good cost-benefit analysis, to consider *all* those benefited.

This brings us to the next question: Who is going to do the analysis? I recently ran across a learned, careful cost-benefit evaluation of child care programs, reckoning the effects on children, that began with a statement by the writer saying he had long cherished the opinion that parents in paid employment are a principal source of damage to children. Now, I submit that the writer is likely to find what he is looking for. So a major consideration in doing these evaluations is who is doing it on behalf of whom.

The next problem is what the economists would call a "problem in coinages," that is to say, the question of the different types of benefits a child care program provides. There is the happiness of children; there are the dollars earned by parents; there is the tremendous expansion of jobs for staff. Those are apples and oranges that are very hard to reckon together. Because of that, a program that is started for one purpose may be evaluated in terms of totally different aims. Head Start, for example, was started to improve the self-image of children and to break the poverty cycle, but it was evaluated in terms of the cognitive gains of the children. The apples and oranges, the coinage problem in evaluation, is usually thought to be insurmountable for the cost-benefit analysis of human services.

Just to run very quickly through other problems in accurately analyzing the costs and benefits of a day care program: A good evaluation should look at "opportunity costs," that is, what would happen without this program. You are evaluating this program with respect to what alternatives? A staff-child ratio of 1-to-45 for infants in an Indian reservation may look horrendous until you realize that those children used to be left in the backs of locked cars. If you look, therefore, at the actual alternatives, your program may look very good indeed. Then there are all the indirect effects of child care programs. There are the interaction effects: helping the child helps the family, which helps the program, and so on. There are the unexpected effects that nobody tests for because they weren't looking for them in the first place. And there are the many problems just of measurement, in measuring different kinds of gains. We do not yet know how to measure accurately just the gains in the cognitive areas, much less in the areas of social and emotional development. And we do not regularly report ranges of results. For example, what may happen in many child care centers is that 10 per cent of the children are enormously benefited, but these gains are not clearly evident when you look only at the overall, average results.

For all these reasons, then, the traditional cost-benefit analysis that everybody would like, if they are going to be in the "policy camp 4" that Mr. Ruopp described, is just impossible. What, then, do we do in order to justify ourselves in the eyes of the world? Most of us think that cost-effectiveness analysis of one kind or another is probably the answer. Here, again, there are two possible kinds. One is the "constant cost" cost-effectiveness analysis, which asks, "For a given amount of money, say $100,000 a year, what can a center produce operated at its most efficient level?" The second approach is the "least cost" option, which asks, "We want a center of a certain kind — how can we produce it at the least cost?" Child care people are regularly in the first camp. They say, give us the money and let us see what we can do with it. Legislators of the Nixonian variety are regularly in the second camp. They say, what is the minimum that kids can survive with and how can we produce that most efficiently?

I think that all of us who have ever run a child program will be sturdily in that first camp and for two very specific reasons. The first is that the variation in child programs that is desirable is rivaled only by the variation among children — different children need different programs. Second, to say that we want a specified program and then try to figure out how to produce that with the least amount of dollars completely ignores the different sources of resources around the country, in urban and rural areas, in inner-city and suburban areas, and so on.

What has our research team done with these difficulties? Faced with this intellectual conundrum of how to demonstrate cost effectiveness, we decided to find out what different individual programs can actually do with a tiny amount of money. Our first attempt in 1970-71 was to go out to 20 centers and systems with an aggregate of 6,000 children and just see and describe what good programs looked like and how they spent their money. The second attempt was a refinement of that first. It happened this last year in Maryland, where we described and analyzed what happens in an entire state system and tried to establish some careful measurements of cost effectiveness.

• • •

Richard Ruopp: Before we examine some of the critical issues that states must face in establishing their own day care programs and making decisions about their future investments in day care, let's look at some of the facts that will define the field for the next five years.

First, day care centers are on the increase by about 10 per cent per year, with a shift from part-time to full-time day care, indicating an increase in demand, and we estimate that this growth will continue. Second, the declining birth rate may actually promote an increase, rather than a decrease, in day care for several reasons. One, the nuclear family, as it gets smaller, will need more and more to have group experiences that used to be provided by larger family groups. Third, if you have only two children, it is easier to make arrangements for all of them than if you have six. Fourth, if you have only two, you may have a bit more time that you want to invest in other things, and day care arrangements provide that possiblity. In addition, increasing employment options, particularly for women, will also have an impact on the need for child care. It is estimated that possibly 50 per cent of the female population will be in the labor force by 1980.

The reason the push is going to be toward formal or monetized child care, of course, is that the nonmonetized supply continues to dry up — partly because more and more people are working; partly because many of the people doing it, the aunts and uncles and grandmothers, will not be around that much longer, or will themselves be in part-time employment and not available. The continuing pressure for welfare reform, the reintroduction of the Brademas-Mondale bill for child and family services indicate that there will be continued public pressure for some kind of public day care provision. Moreover, many parents are willing to pay at least part of the cost. For example, if you stop to think that a family may require up to 2,250 hours of child care, and if you have to pay $1 an hour for a babysitter at home these days, that could mount up to $2,250 a year for a family to buy child-sitting service out of their own pockets. If they have an alternative costing $2,000 a year or less, and it is still tax deductible, they may choose center or family home day care over the individual babysitter.

Besides all these reasons for the growth of day care demands, some of us take the view that, since children are our country's most important natural resource, it is wise to be investing in that natural resource. Perhaps it is even more important than energy conservation and pollution abatement since, presumably, we want somebody around who knows how to use the world in the future.

• • •

Rowe: One of the things we are frequently asked is, what are the most critical factors for the development of good child programs on a state level? I have four rules of thumb. Rule of thumb No. 1: The backing for your child programs must be bipartisan and widely based at the local level. That is to say, you need to conduct regional meetings all over the state; you need regularly to bring together local groups of all kinds to talk about children's programs, part-time and full-time day care and other kinds of child care and after-school care. It must be put on a bipartisan basis. That is item one.

Item two is that you need a survey. You can't get anywhere politically unless you know what is being supplied, for how much money and what people want. Of these two qeustions, supply and demand, the second is the more important. Legislators are regularly astonished that parents all over the map are ready to vote state moneys for programs for children, and that lots of nonparents are also ready to vote state moneys for these programs. People who conduct day care surveys regularly find that the interviewers are kept for four hours instead of one, with their ears being talked off, and that in national and state and regional polls the taxpayers want children's programs. So, rule No. 2 is, do a survey — what have you got and what do your taxpayers say they want?

Rule No. 3 is the "warm body" rule. You need a half a dozen people who are committed to child care full time, who are warm, able and can work full time at it for a period of at least two years. It can be done through children's lobbies, an office for children or dedicated volunteers; but you have to have a small group of people around whom others coalesce.

And, finally, rule No. 4: you need a resource search. The watchword for funding children's programs is that the resources always come from multiple sources. Many uninformed people think day care funding must come only from the federal government, but the facts are that the government funds child care programs to the tune of about 50 per cent and the other 50 per cent comes from many, many people — in-kind donations, state programs, churches, unions, all kinds of other community groups. So, rule No. 4 is do a resource search based on the proposition that there will be multiple sources of resources.

• • •

Ruopp: If I were a legislator in 1974 and wanted to support the development of a more rational approach to day care in my state, I would probably do something like the following: First, I would recognize that the quality-quantity issue is likely to be the nub of a lot of the controversy, and I would try to figure out for myself what that means and take my own position on it. With respect to quantity: Who is to be served and by what kind of programs? Is it going to be only parents who need full-time care? Is it going to include parents who need part-time care, after-school care, etc? This is one of the issues that has to be dealt with because the associated numbers become critical in terms of costs. Of course, the greatest good for the greatest number of people is historically not a bad platform to stand on.

On the quality side, we are still facing a conundrum. As Ms. Rowe points out, we still do not know how to measure good outcomes for children that we know will endure after the children move out of preschool into the benign or corrosive or supportive environment of public education, depending on your value position. We do not know exactly what should be measured. There are a variety of views about affective measurement, cognitive measurement, happiness indexes, warmth indexes and so on. So, measuring quality becomes difficult, but I believe that it can be done better now than it could a few years ago.

When we did a study of publicly funded day care in the state of Maryland we tried to ask the question as a legislator might ask it: What is a wise investment of public funds in day care? What constitutes, from a consumer point of view — that is both the public and the legislature — a "best buy"? Instead of trying to define "best buy" day care by depending on expert opinion or advocacy camps in the day care world, we went out and tried to find a number of day homes and centers that, on process measures — such as the quality of the staff (director, teachers, and non-care staff), the quality of interactions (between staff members and children, and between staff members and each other), the quality of program (for children, for parents, for staff), the quality of the support program, and the quality of plant materials — seemed to measure up in a way that people with good common sense would say, "This is a place I want to put children for nine hours a day." Now, that is not terribly sophisticated. It does not have the advantage of multiple regression runs on a computer and so on, but in 1974 I think I would be satisfied, as a legislator, with a systematic look at those things that people can still agree seem to be good processes for children — warm, healthy, educational care that we believe certainly will not damage children and may prove to their long-term benefit.

When we found centers in Maryland that met our quality standards, we then looked at their cost and we found some centers that were delivering quality care at reasonable costs. We then defined an empirically based "best buy" standard from which we could derive some rules of thumb for the state of Maryland to assess what it should be paying for contracted purchase-of-care arrangements, and what it could expect a reasonable range of quality to look like.

Until we have ways of measuring what happens to little children, until we have some commonly accepted definitions and instruments that have been tested nationally, we are going to have to continue to take a look at the actual treatment, the process, that children undergo. Therefore, the day care director and the care givers themselves continue to be probably the most positive index of publicly approved quality care for children — a nonabusive, warm, reasonably happy environment. There is nothing wrong with a child who is happy every day, even if one has not made a life-long contribution to getting him into Massachusetts Institute of Technology. We think quality can be measured, at least at that level, and we think it is important to be able to do that, systematically, across a number of centers. A state can develop its own day care quality priority system and get its own act together and use its day care directors and experts to set values around those quality priorities.

• • •

Rowe: I'll assume for the moment that you have measured quality, though I would like to associate myself with what Mr. Ruopp said: The years from birth through 14 represent one-fifth of that child's lifetime, and that age group represents one-fourth of our entire population; so if all you do is make the children happy from birth through 14, you have already done more than any other national program we know about. I personally can justify child care without ever seeing a "long-term benefit."

Back to costs. Let me say at the outset, there is nothing mystic about costs. Why costs vary as they do — between $500 a year for kindergarten in Massachusetts to $4,500 a year for a preschool program in New York City — is very well understood. This is partly just because child care costs are 70 per cent to 80 per cent dependent on the people in a program. Reported costs for preschool programs regularly vary between about $2,000 and $5,000 per child per year for various other reasons, however. Of these reasons, the most important are prices. That is, prices for the same program vary around the country by a factor of about 100 per cent between Mississippi and inner-city New York, and they vary every year, partly due to the increasing unionization of child care workers. In addition, inflation in child care costs has been at least 10 per cent per year since 1970.

A major problem on costs is, how do you get the data? This is no trivial question. On our telephone surveys to day care directors we regularly find that the answers we get from well-informed directors differ from the real data by as much as 50 per cent, mainly because overworked directors do not realize how many community resources they have actually recruited for their programs. So, just getting the data on real costs is a steady, hard-work project that requires a couple of days per center. Please use standard forms when you do it. Standardizing the forms means prorating your program as if it were something on the order of 250 days per year, 9 to 10 hours per day, with a standard number of holidays. Unless you have put a budget into standard form, it is not possible to compare your budget to anybody else's.

Another major cost question is the difference between enrollment costs and average daily attendance costs. Somewhere between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of the variation in reported child care costs among similar programs is due only to the fact that enrollment and average daily attendance vary so much and that some centers report on one basis, some on another. On the average, there is at least a 10 per cent difference between enrollment and attendance, and in centers where children come by transportation the difference may be as much as 25 per cent. This is very important in planning for child care programs because if you are going to have a 25 per cent difference between enrollment and average daily attendance you probably should over-enroll by your factor of absenteeism.

In order to reckon child care costs for a given program, all of the figures must be in full-time equivalency units of hours per year for both staff and children. It is only when you have those figures that you can begin to reckon what is actually happening in a program.

But of all the factors that are of critical importance in reckoning child care costs, the one that is probably most important (especially in costing excellent programs) has to do with in-kind donations. In a center like the Children's Lump House Center, for instance, if you look only at the approved budget and only at the number of children, you might find that the cost per child per year is somewhere between $4,000 and $4,500. However, if you then look at the services that are actually provided to the families and children, if you look at the number of service hours actually delivered by that center, you might find almost twice the number of child care hours. That is, probably twice as many service hours are delivered as are paid for.

If you look at extra inputs you will find, in addition to what shows up on the standard budget, at least the following: a family counseling program; medical and dental programs with testing, psychological testing and remedial work; an extraordinary food co-op, which not only provides food at probably an average of 30 per cent to 40 per cent lower than in the stores, but also teaches nutrition; an extraordinary baby-sitting service whichdoes not show up on the budget at all (because it is entirely in-kind) but which contributes, for 32 families, at least 1,000 baby-sitting hours per year. There is a staff training program; an elaborate program of home visits that would include even hospital visits where somebody in the family is sick; job counseling, job finding.

On the record it looks as though Pump House has 2,580 staff hours per year, but those are only the paid hours. The staff, in addition, works at least 400 or 500 hours per year overtime, and at least another 100 hours per year in their own training. There are at least 1,000 volunteered hours that do not show up on the budget, and the director works an average of 60 hours per week. I am sure that does not include the weeks where she also works 70 or 80 hours. The total in-kind donation would, by my estimate, show up as about a 30 per cent increase on the budget of real resources used.

If, taking all of these factors into consideration, I then worked out a real cost per child per year for direct services to children, that cost might drop from $4,500 to something like $3,000. And if I were to cost-out the "human service hours" per year provided to children and families associated with the center, the cost might easily drop to $2,000 per year per child. So, the costing question is not a mystic process. It is easy and straightforward to do, but you have to be very careful if you are to discover what is actually being delivered for the cash dollars that you find in state budgets.

• • •

Niemeyer: This is a good moment for us to turn to the Children's Pump House Center. Irma Garay, the director, prior to her work at the center, was for many years in community service. The Pump House is in the heart of Harlem, on 126th Street. There are 32 families officially connected with it, and it provides all of the services that Ms. Rowe has mentioned. How did the center ever get started?

• • •

Irma Garay: The community services I worked for was funded by an Office of Economic Opportunity program under the sponsorship of St. Mary's Episcopal Church. I went there as a community organizer. I was very turned off, like everybody else, by the antipoverty program, and I went there feeling very skeptical. Then I began to evaluate and to make surveys of what people wanted and needed in the community. There was a need for day care, even though there was day care in a couple nearby housing projects. We made a special survey of the people as to why they really needed day care — to enable them to go into some kind of training or to go to college, or simply to survive and get jobs and get off the welfare rolls, or just to preserve their own sanity. People started asking me, "Why don't you start a baby-sitting service?" And I said, "I'm going to try."

So I went to the church again and I asked them for donated space. There was no money available; there was nothing but the salary that I was getting for working in community service. So they gave us the space without rent, but that was only for a limited time because I think they felt that it would never work. But we got in there and we fixed it up. We got the parents we needed to service it. In a matter of two weeks, we had 25 families in this program. Young girls with children, who otherwise would have been sitting at home and just having children one right after the other, then found time to go to college, or possibly to high school, and continue their education; maybe they were high school dropouts. Women who wanted to get off the welfare rolls, women who needed to help their husbands in order to pay the rent and just survive, came in to us, and they became the Board of the Children's Pump House.

The reason it is named Pump House (and I want to insert this because people laugh about it) is because when I went out to try to get other space to build a bigger center — and in New York there is no space; people are living on the windowsills, as you may know — there was a little gas station that was going out of business. So I went to Humble Oil and I asked them how much they wanted for the land. The amount they asked for was only a drop in the bucket for them, so I went hog wild and I said, "Why don't you just donate it to the community?" Well, the idea went to Texas and back again and so forth and so on, but they finally donated this piece of land to us. At this time, as I said, we were not an incorporated group. We were getting money the best way we could. We were going to the local stores asking them for day-old loaves of bread and things like that. So, the deed to the land was put in a St. Mary's Church trust.

We are not what they call an established center. I go as much as I can by the guidelines that the Agency for Child Development, the city funding agency, gives me, with that strict budget. You know — X amount of dollars for food when we do not even have a freezer or anywhere to store food. We have to go daily to the local markets, whether there is a sale on or not.

Geographically we are located between the precinct and the methadone center; the only thing we are trying to do is to help these children and keep the families — everybody in them — from winding up in either place. If we can accomplish that, we're doing a great deal of work. The garbage cans are there; the swimming pools are polluted because they don't even take care of our pools. It is a community that people just don't care about, and I mean that literally. I have gotten on the phone to try and get the Parks Department to come and do what its guidelines tell it to do, to take care of those pools every day, because it is the only way we can take our children near water unless we take them on a long train ride to Coney Island, which is worse.

We have one large room on one floor. One flight up is my office with the family counselor and the bookkeeper and the kitchen in the back. We do everything right in the one room. We have the use of a gym downstairs; we only have the use of it, we do not pay rent, but we have made a sort of arrangement, and I have a key and we open it when it is raining.

• • •

Gardenia White: As Ms. Rowe stated, the Children's Pump House is truly a family day care program. Working with this program, I am specifically concerned with service to the family. One of the things that Ms. Rowe did not mention is that we do have a full-day educational program for 32 children. We also have a women's consciousness-raising group, after-school tutoring and an inservice training program in conjunction with Bank Street College, where our teachers are getting their state certification. Whenever the needs arise in a family, we try to develop a program to meet those needs of the family.

• • •

Niemeyer: I might say that the Pump House is one of four centers working with Bank Street and a unit of New York State University. It is really a joint development of an effective inservice training program. The college doesn't come in and tell them what to do. The program is based on a joint analysis and evaluation of their needs, the total needs of the center.

• • •

Jackie Monthe: For the last four years I worked in established day care centers in New York City. There is a kind of a hierarchy in day care where you have the old established centers that are run by settlement houses and community centers that are managed by the wealthy people in New York. The board members will come once a month for a meeting, but they do not know the parents, they do not know the children. After the board meeting they leave and they still do not know anything about the parents and the children. Working in that kind of a setting, I found the parents dropped their children off in the morning and picked them up in the afternoon and had no idea of what their children were doing; they had no contact with the school. Working in such a setting, I felt that the children were practically living in the day care center and I did not even know their parents. I did not know what the children did at home and the parents did not know what the children did in school.

When I looked for another job I was very attracted by the family atmosphere at the Pump House. There I not only teach and deal with the children, but I work with the parents as well. The staff holds workshops for the parents. We like to feel we are training the parents, helping them learn about their children and the growth of their children, about the education that their children should be getting, not only at the Pump House but in later years in the public schools.

At the Pump House I can talk informally with the parents and can get a good idea of what the child's needs are on a particular day. Maybe something happened at home last night, for example, and the child is going to be upset this morning. If I know this, I can give that child just a little something special to help him through the day. And I hope I can give the parents something special, too, if they come to me and say, "Oh, gee, I've been offered a job and I don't know if I should take it," or "Where is a good place to buy shoes?" or, "I just don't really know what to do with myself today."

I feel that the Pump House has a program that is really satisfying the needs of the parents and the children. I think the staff also is growing and learning so much, not only by the training but by being exposed to so many aspects of the school. It helps me get a better understanding of how a school is run, and I hope I can always use it to good advantage.

• • •

Niemeyer: Ms. Garay, you said that one of the things you insist on is that all staff members live in the neighborhood of the center. Is that right?

• • •

Garay: Yes, we try to keep it in the community because I do not think that somebody who lives down on Park Avenue would understand. Community people can really deal with the problems. They can understand that a child might be wearing sneakers in the winter time because his parent probably did not have the money to buy shoes and the sneakers were cheap. Outsiders cannot understand some of the husbands and wives, the bickering and fighting that sometimes goes on simply because of the overwhelming problems of surviving with their children, with the rent steadily going up and the food going up.

Community members, on the other hand, have the same problems, so they can understand. When a parent comes to them with a problem, they know that they went through that problem, too, and they know how they managed to overcome it. So they're the best psychologists in the world. They can tell that parent, "Look, this is what I did when it happened to me." Those parents are able to relate to that teacher because they do not feel they are getting a lesson out of a book.

Niemeyer: Tell us a little bit about your problems with the state. What really would be the most helpful, if policies were changed at the state level?

• • •

Garay: One of the problems with the state is that it tends to equate New York City with the rest of the state where the cost of living is much lower and people can have homes of their own at mortgages lower than the New York City rent for a four-room apartment infested with roaches and mice. When they decide in Albany what budget they are going to allot to our center in New York City, they do it without the input of the people who are directly responsible, who are working with this center and know what the costs are and how much we have to struggle to keep within the guidelines of that budget.

I am constantly in trouble with the agency for going over the budget. Our budget was made up in 1966; it has not changed since then. They have not taken into consideration that the telephone company wants more money, that Con Edison wants more money, that the food stores want more money, that the unions want more money, that the cost of everything — cubbyholes, cots, everything — has gone up double or more. They still want you to keep within that guideline, and it's impossible.

• • •

Niemeyer: Is there any mechanism through which people like you, who are right down there at the grass roots working with these families, can talk to legislators?

• • •

Garay: No, we don't. The Agency for Child Development has two buildings full of what they call technical consultants, educational consultants, health consultants, social service consultants, nutritional consultants. But it is actually a police department to see that you stay within the guidelines of the budget that they have given you. I have been lucky. There are two or three consultants who come to the Pump House, and we have built a kind of rapport among us. I take them around to the food shops and show them how much things cost. And so they know; they have seen it. But when they go back to their office, they tell themselves there is nothing they can do about it. We have to be accountable to the Agency for Child Development, which is a funding agency under the city's Human Resources Administration, but that agency does not have to be accountable to us. That is what I feel is so unfair.

Rowe: Let me just say this to legislators. Places like Pump House are vastly more cost effective than public education. Each of the state dollars spent on a center like that is, as you have heard, "levered" or multiplied, by a factor of, say, 6 to 8. First, because probably three-quarters of the money is federal in origin; that is already a leverage of 1 to 4. But second, because each cash dollar is levered by 50 cents or maybe even one dollar with the in-kind services, the overtime and the donations. That means that if you look at the moneys that the state has approved, you find a child care service for something like $4,000 per child per year, of which $1,000 is state money. If you look at the approved cash cost per human-service hour in the state of New York at that center, the yearly cost might be somewhere between $2,000 and $3,000. You will see this is an enormously cost-effective use for state dollars in this particular case. Each state dollar buys four dollars' worth of child service and six to eight dollars' worth of human service.

• • •

Ruopp: I have been asked a couple times about whether states can really get it together. Well, we have some evidence that some states are doing it. It is not easy, however. It is not easy because most states have entrenched bureaucracies that not only compete with the public about licensing and regulation issues in day care, but compete with each other — the health department, the department of employment services, the department of labor and various other state departments. There is a need to pick a single point in a state bureaucracy to begin to organize some cooperation. It is my own personal belief that that can do more for the quality of child care than worrying about putting a lot of restrictions and regulations on local centers.

If I were a state legislator, I would work to have only one single point of quality control, initially, and that would be the competency of the day care center director or home mother. I would certify directors and home mothers and leave everything else alone, because competent leadership will almost always make competent day care settings. It is an old-fashioned American notion that somebody who knows how to do something gets it done.

I think that states can do a lot more. It is really a matter of organizing the bureaucracy to get the job done well. Spend some Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) funds on research. That can be done. The state of Maryland put only $12,000 of its own money into the study we did for them, and SRS supplied the other $48,000. So you can use some of the AFDC Title IV funds for research for the survey Ms. Rowe talked about and lever those federal dollars as far as you can.

Making State Policies for Children

Dale Bumpers, Governor of Arkansas

We have become increasingly aware in America of the need to plan for the wise use of our natural resources — for the preservation of forests and wildernesses, for unpolluted streams and air, for more constrained energy use. As a measure of our concern for the environment, we require anyone planning any major projects to file an Environmental Impact Statement.

John Kennedy once said children are our most valuable resource and our best hope for the future. I think we all agree, and I would suggest that what we need in the future is an Early Childhood Development Impact Statement. No matter what kind of education dollars are flowing into the state, I do not think it would hurt to file a statement saying what the effect of this will be on children from birth to 5 years of age. In the past, our planning for children in this country has been mostly on a hit-or-miss basis. We have been filling in the gaps, providing fragmented programs, and the results have been just less than chaotic.

As the husband said to his paramour, "We can't go on like this." Our best hope lies with those states that are beginning to move toward comprehensive planning for children's programs. Instead of reacting to federal priorities that have been both unrealistic and disappointing, some states are building priorities of their own. They are defining quality and taking steps to see that this quality is achieved. The federal programs might take note and follow suit.

States have been criticized in the past for resisting change and considered less competent to plan for and administer children's programs than those at the federal levels. This is spurious thinking. States are proving that they have the capacity for leadership and that they respect the rights of communities to determine how programs should be operated at the local level. Those closest to children — parents, child care personnel, teachers — are being involved in designing programs, and the result is more coherent, more practical policies. State planning has centered around the needs of the child and his family and has not indulged the common, but false, logic that because a service was available, needs were being met. We at the state level are eliminating barriers that keep children from receiving services. This means getting more results out of present dollars spent on children's programs and less duplication and overlap.

Let me give an example. Public health clinics in Arkansas had furnished free immunizations for years — that is, the service was available. But records showed that at least half the children between 6 months and 11 years had not been fully immunized. Four out of every five 2-year-olds had not received the recommended four polio doses. It was like sitting on a keg of dynamite.

In 1964 the nation suffered a dramatic outbreak of rubella, and in Arkansas, for instance, this resulted in several hundred rubella-syndrome children. When we began to plan an action program to prevent this from happening again, we found that many parents did not know that their children needed immunizations. Some did not have transportation; others worked and could not bring their children during the hours the clinics were open. Mrs. Bumpers organized a massive corps of volunteers, along with the Arkansas League for Nursing, and I recruited the Arkansas National Guard and State Health Department.

These and representatives of other government agencies and private organizations joined together to assist the local health units in conducting 250 weekend immunization clinics last September. The campaign used many methods of getting the word to parents — spot announcements, news stories, pamphlets, telephone calls. Volunteers and guardsmen worked out transportation systems, and the weekend clinic hours eliminated the problems of working parents. Some 66,000 children received innoculations as a result of the weekend clinics alone. More than 300,000 were immunized from the time the publicity started until the September clinics were completed. An annual U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare regional report showed that immunizations for childhood disease last year increased 102 per cent in Arkansas as compared with a 32 per cent increase in the five other states in the region. I tell you that story simply because it shows what action can do.

Mrs. Bumpers is now organizing a second immunization drive this year called "Operation Wipeout," which will be directed primarily toward the very young children, ages 2 months to 4 years, who were missed in last year's campaign. This year a more sustained drive is planned over a four-month period. Public health clinic hours are being adjusted to the late afternoon and evening needs of working parents. Volunteer action centers and the National Guard are notifying parents and furnishing transportation again. The objective this time is to develop the pattern for a permanent program of parent education and clinic accessibility. The total cost is about what it would cost the state to care for two rubella-syndrome children through a lifetime.

The agencies that worked together on this drive ranged from the Cooperative Extension Service to the County Judges Association, and the results proved that coordination at the state level can produce cooperation at the local levels as well. The fact that these agencies are willing to get together and repeat last year's effort is proof that a continuing effort of this kind is possible.

Last year we began the same kind of coordinated effort in planning for all children. This planning culminated in the establishment of an interagency council on early childhood planning. We combined two offices, the Office of Early Childhood Development in the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services and the Follow-Through Office in the Department of Education, into the Office of Early Childhood Planning. Our present goal is to establish a single office for children within the Department of Education, but it will draw on every agency that deals with children or renders children's services.

Our decision to move in this direction has been based on several factors. When we reorganized state government in Arkansas three years ago, we took 65 departments and combined them into 13 major departments. We assigned all programs to those basic units. One purpose, of course, was to streamline government, but you cannot streamline government unless you bring about a realignment of compatible programs, particularly the newer ones that had been previously set apart. I feel strongly that the major old-line agencies must be seriously involved in any planning that attempts to meet the total developmental needs of children. Change will not happen unless those agencies are involved in and directly committed to the planning effort. Since the Department of Education has, through local school districts, a base in every local community, and since it does touch the life of every child, this seemed the logical place to get the widest possible program impact.

Since our Early Childhood Office was the first to be set up in the country (in 1968), we have had the advantage of experience with several alternatives, first having it as a wing of the governor's office, then in Social and Rehabilitation Services, and now assigned to the Department of Education. We have found that in planning for children, as in all planning, the temptation is to see present agencies and institutions as intractable and unyielding and to use that as an excuse to bypass them. Then new agencies are established and they in turn become as bureaucratic as those they were designed to replace. This is both costly and, in the end, more divisive. It does not make sense to pull children in different directions because of incompatible systems. It is our responsibility to make those systems with which the child is already involved consistent and responsive to his total needs.

I am not suggesting that all new money go through the old channels, but it seems that sensible state planning must involve those agencies presently administering the bulk of the money for children. Local planning must, in the same way, especially involve the public schools, even though they may have been unresponsive to some of the needs of young children in the past. The point is, rather than working around institutions, I believe we must work with them. Planning must be done in a manner that brings together those who deal with children at different stages in their development, as well as those who work across agency or institutional lines.

It seems to me that by maintaining this contact and influence, those who are working in early childhood have a unique opportunity to revitalize systems. When we talk about the involvement of the public schools, for instance, it is obvious that we do not want to extend schooling, in its most rigid sense, downward. I want early childhood training to avoid the rigid stereotype programs; I want broad opportunities and broad visions, not tunnel vision. It is the only method by which every child has an equal chance. I believe early childhood programs have the potential for a great impact on the public schools. Much early childhood research has dealt with how children learn, which people are important to that learning and what community resources can be made available to the learner. The possibilities that are thereby opened to the rest of education are immense, and those who are policymakers at the state and federal levels should consider them thoughtfully.

When I became governor in 1971, Arkansas was not only without public school kindergartens, but there was still considerable opposition to the concept. Last year we managed to get enough funding from the legislature to begin a kindergarten program for 44 per cent of our 5-year-olds. I considered it an accomplishment of major proportions. With just one year's experience to demonstrate their value, I went back to a special session of the legislature last month with a request for full funding. The opposition had dissolved and this fall, kindergartens will be available to every 5-year-old in Arkansas.

Part of our early childhood planning has been directed toward keeping the new kindergarten program from becoming isolated either from the primary grades above it or from the nursery school and day care programs below. To accomplish this, the Office of Early Childhood Planning started a Child Development course on Educational Television (ETV). We stressed coordination and continuity. Representatives of early childhood programs at all levels participated in the 32-week series that was offered for college credit. Study guides were mailed each month to more than a thousand persons ranging from parents to elementary principals. The Department of Education's kindergarten staff is following up this year with a second ETC course aimed at primary teachers, and still another ETV series on parent training is in the planning stages.

Our Office of Early Childhood Planning held a series of eight planning forums earlier this year. A need for better parent training and education was identified as a high priority, so the office is working through local communities to set up Parent and Child Resource Centers. Staffed by volunteers to offer parent training to young families, these centers are a substitute for the extended family, offering help with the everyday problems that young parents face. In addition, the office will start mailing informational pamphlets to the parents of first-borns at intervals during the first six years of the child's life. These will reach the parents of 10,000 children in Arkansas this first year alone.

Citizen involvement in the planning process is coming from Committees for Children, which were set up as a result of the planning forums to furnish continued input and to serve as advocates for children. The state plan calls for regional children's centers that would coordinate existing programs, offer some alternative programs for young children and furnish both staff and parent training.

Our planning is not built around finding a single solution. It does not call for putting all young children into group child care or educational programs, but for offering options that fit family and child needs. I think we are proceeding sensibly, without making exaggerated claims for early childhood programs, without pretending that we have all the answers. We are concerned about the quality of family life generally, about the impact of many changes in the last two decades and how they may adversely affect young children. We are concerned about the physical and mental disabilities from which children now suffer that can be prevented. We have tried to be honest, promising no panaceas because we think the likelihood of children being shortchanged is reduced when policymakers are candid and truthful.

I do not want to start placing blame for our past failures and shortsightedness, but the federal government has been remiss in not planning children's programs. The conglomeration of guidelines and eligibility requirements that comes down to state and local levels often seems designed to keep children from getting services rather than making such services available. The cutbacks, the veto of the comprehensive child care legislation and the off again-on again directives of the last two years have contributed to a national policy with regard to children that can only be interpreted as negative.

National statistics about children are unsettling. It has been estimated that more than half of all handicaps could be prevented or lessened with better prenatal care and with early diagnosis and treatment. Yet one million babies are born each year to mothers who do not receive medical care during pregnancy, and many handicaps are neither identified nor treated until the child reaches school age.

Researchers tell us that only 5 to 10 per cent of the money spent on health care in America is spent on those under age 21. Childhood diseases such as scarlet fever, rheumatic fever, diphtheria and measles — which we are capable of controlling and preventing — still regularly take their toll in disabilities and death.

More than half of all women who have school-aged children were working in 1972, and more than one in three of the mothers of children under 6 were in the labor force. Yet high-quality child care for all children who need it, at a price their families can afford, is still for the most part unavailable.

Every state has its own set of statistics on child abuse that is on the increase, on low-birth weight, high-risk babies, on teen-age pregnancies, on accidents in which children die from fires, from poisonings, from drownings, on the absence of good child care and preschool programs.

It is obvious that a larger effort on behalf of children must be made, and, speaking on behalf of a state that is interested in making that effort, I would like to offer some suggestions for a state policy for children.

First, since so much of the learning that helps to shape a person's life takes place before the age of 5, some form of education should be made available to all children and their parents who wish to take advantage of it much earlier than traditionally provided.

Second, since there are no absolute answers as to what kind of education is best for children and their parents, a variety of approaches and learning situations should be offered.

Third, parent involvement in planning is essential to keep professionals in touch with reality. It is harder, with parents involved, for professionals to assume they know what is best for children and to come up with easy mass solutions instead of having to deal with the differences in each child and each family.

Fourth, continuity between programs run by different agencies or even within a single agency is essential. Children do not grow and develop in segments, and early childhood programs should not be fragmented or kept separate from programs for older children. A connection between the two should be maintained.

Fifth, families who have been shunted from agency to agency in search of services for children know better than anyone why coordination and an overall information system are needed. It is possible to accomplish more for children, as we learned in the immunization drive in Arkansas, when many agencies pool their resources and work together.

In his book, *Escape From Childhood*, John Holt makes the claim that children are capable of far more than we have allowed; that families and schools have fostered an unhealthy kind of dependence that often hampers rather than facilitates growth. Perhaps the movement toward earlier education, with its emphasis on diverse ways of developing and learning, will also affect the way we think about older children. Why should there not be more ways to learn and grow outside as well as inside school and away from home?

Because Arkansas is still bound by many rural traditions, we have been able to get people to work together in a way that is admittedly harder to accomplish in more heavily populated areas. When differences occur, and they have, they can be hammered out on a person-to-person basis. Those who get together know local situations well enough to plan individually for them.

Our problems are not related to bigness but to smallness — to counties where there are no doctors much less pediatricians, to counties where there is no public day care, to school districts that enroll less than 100 students — which means an absence of resources. But it also means that our problems are often of a more manageable size than some of those in larger states. Certainly each state has its own unique set of problems and potential in programs for children, and I am impressed with the competency and the creativeness exhibited in those states that have established procedures for dealing comprehensively with the needs of children. I believe that we have the capability and talent within each state to make better things happen and that, with the development of a partnership of trust between the state and federal levels, the future can be a bright one for young children.

Program Participants and Resource Consultants

Allen, Sally V., Director, ECS Communications Department, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203

Bumpers, Dale, Governor, State Capitol, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Caldwell, Bettye, Professor of Education, University of Arkansas, 814 Sherman Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

Carmichael, Benjamin E., Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, 100 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Finberg, Barbara D., Program Officer, Carnegie Corporation of New York, 437 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022

Fraser, Brian, Staff Attorney, National Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect, 1001 Jasmine, Denver, Colorado 80220

Gallagher, James T., Director, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Garay, Irma, Director, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, 514 W. 126th Street, New York, New York 10027

Granato, Sam, Day Care Officer, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 2017 N.W. Irving, Portland, Oregon 97210

Green, Frederick, Associate Director, Children's Hospital National Medical Center, and Director of the Center's Office for Child Health Advocacy, 2125 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

Hawes, John R. B., Jr., Executive Director, Learning Institute of North Carolina, 1006 Lamond Street, Durham, North Carolina 27701

Hensley, Gene, Director, HACHE Project, Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203

Himelrick, John B., Sr., Director, Interagency Council for Child Development Services, Capitol Complex, Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Hughes, Jerome M., State Senator, 328 Capitol Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Lazarus, Wendy, Health Specialist, Children's Defense Fund, 1763 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

Liederman, David S., Director, Office for Children, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Martin, Edward, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of the Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202

Meredith, Judith C., Former Director of Community Development Office for Children, 52 Howe Street, Farmington, Massachusetts 01701

Mondale, Walter, United States Senator, Washington, D.C. 20510

Monthe, Jacqueline, Classroom Staff Member, Children's Pump House of New York, 514 W. 126th Street, New York, New York 10027

Nesenholtz, David, Planning Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, P.O. Box 13166, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711

Niemeyer, John H., President Emeritus, Bank Street College of Education, 77 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10011

O'Keefe, Ann, National Director, Home Start and Child and Family Resource Program, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, P.O. Box 1182, Washington, D.C. 20013

Pierson, Donald E., Director, Brookline Early Education Project, 40 Centre Street, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

Rowe, Mary, Special Assistant to the President and Chancellor for Women and Work, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Building 10 - Room 213, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Rowe, Richard, Associate Professor, Clinical Psychology and Public Practice Program, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Ruopp, Richard, Vice President, Human Development Area, ABT Associates, 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Sanstad, Margaret H., Day Care Specialist, Office of Child Development - Region X, 710 Second Avenue, Room 1490, Seattle, Washington 98104

Sargent, Jessie F., Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts, Room 159A, Statehouse, Boston, Massachusetts 02133

Schrag, Howard, Director, Human Development Institute, Statehouse, Boise, Idaho 83720

Sugarman, Jule, Chief Administrative Officer, City Hall, Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Tillman, Melissa, Director, Day Care Licensing and Consulting Unit, Office for Children, Room 246, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

Watson, Jeannette, Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, P.O. Box 13166, Capitol Station, Austin, Texas 78711

White, Burton, Director, Preschool Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 415 Larsen Hall, Appian Way, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

White, Gardenia, Training Consultant, Children's Pump House of New York, 514 W. 126th Street, New York, New York 10027

Wolverton, E. Dollie, Program Planning Specialist, Children's Bureau, Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, P.O. Box 1182, Washington, D.C. 20012

Symposium Participants

Abraham, Nancy, Director, State Office of Child Development, Utah
Abrams, Rosalie S., State Senator, Maryland
Alford, Roy, Associate Director, MPEP, West Virginia
Andrews, J.D., National Conference Coordinator, NAEYC, Washington, D.C.
Atkins, Hannah, State Representative, Oklahoma
Auman, T. Clyde, State Representative, North Carolina
Backman, Jack, State Senator, Massachusetts
Bacon, Randy, Kentucky Infant and Preschool Project, Kentucky
Baines, G.R.H., Regional Program Director OCD, OHD, DHEW, Illinois
Barry, Mary, Coordinator, Exceptional Child Component, Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
Bates, Sue Ann, Preschool-Kindergarten Consultant, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Bauer, Randall, Early Childhood Education, Pennsylvania
Beck, Rochelle, Editor/Researcher, Children's Defense Fund, Massachusetts
Blair, Marie P., Child-Care Coordinator, Bureau of Social Welfare, Maine
Bloom, Marlene, Senior Editor, Education U.S.A., Virginia
Boone, Rosa, Early Childhood Consultant, Department of Community Action, Connecticut
Boverini, Walter J., State Senator, Massachusetts
Brooks, Chet, State Senator, Texas
Browne, James, Coordinator, The Associates Program Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.
Bullock, Joan, Director, Mobilization of Resources, New Jersey
Bunton, Scott, Staff Administrator, Texas House of Representatives, Texas
Burrell, Tina, Specialist, Community Services for Children, Office of Human Development, DHEW, Massachusetts
Bursley, Gilbert, State Senator, Michigan
Butler, John A., Associate, Harvard Health Project, Massachusetts
Campbell, Bertha, Supervisor, Bureau Child and Parent Education, State Education Department, New York
Campbell, Faye, Director, Head Start Training, Office of the Governor, SEOC, Oklahoma
Capp, Dee, S. W. Consultant, Maternal and Child Health, State Department and Environmental Services, Montana
Carnes, Betty, Director, Office of Child Development, South Carolina
Carpenter, Phoebe, Administrator of Community Coordinated Child Care for Central Florida, Inc., Florida
Carter, Manya, Director, Haley Bell Child Development Center, Michigan
Cataldo, Michael, Regional Director, Institute for the Development of Human Resources, New York
Chandler, Richard, State Representative, Kentucky
Chapman, Evelyn, Child Care Coordinator, City of Seattle, Department of Human Resources, Washington

Chase, Richard Allen, M.D., Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Maryland

Clancy, Johann, Consultant, Early Child Education, Department of Education, Florida

Clay, Barbara Lou, Director, Early Childhood Planning, Interagency Council for Child Development Services, West Virginia

Colley, Pat, Office of Urban and Federal Affairs, Tennessee

Collins, Betsy, Executive Secretary, Interagency Council for Child Development, Vermont

Collins, Kenalene J., State Representative, Vermont

Comba, Trudy, Director of Early Child Programs, Boise State University, Idaho

Contois, Duane, Northwest Human Services, Michigan

Copeland, Janet E., Program Coordinator, Department of Mental Health, Tennessee

Dallas, Jo, Institute for Children, Department of Human Resources, Kentucky

Davis, Glenn H., Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, California

Davis, Renee A., Child Development Specialist, Office of Child Development, DHEW, Massachusetts

Days, Pat, National Association for Child Development and Education, Washington, D.C.

Dermatis, Sophie, Consultant, Office for Children, Massachusetts

Devitt, James, State Senator, Wisconsin

Diepenbrock, Bill, Office of Child Development, Washington, D.C.

Dixon, Brooke, Education Director, Oakland County Commission on Economic Opportunity, Michigan

Doran, Rodney L., Administrative Assistant, Office of the Governor, Connecticut

Drain, Theodore R., Director, State Department of Public Instruction, North Carolina

Draper, Wanda, Early Childhood Specialist, Oklahoma

Dreps, Frances M., Day Care Services Supervisor, DHR, Division of Social Services, North Carolina

Duffy, Sr. Elizabeth, R.S.M., Director, Roger Williams Day Care Center, Rhode Island

Dunavant, Leonard C., State Senator, Tennessee

Edwards, A. L. "Nancy," Project Director, Appalachia Child Care Projects, Georgia

Elliott, David H., State Senator, Delaware

Espinoza, Renato, Component Coordinator-Parenting Materials Center, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Texas

Faust, William, State Senator, Michigan

Fendley, Carey, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina

Fink, Arlene, Assistant Director, Preschool Project, Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, California

Flaherty, Michael F., State Representative, Massachusetts

Flores, Rudy, Special Assistant, Office of the Governor, Texas

Floyd, LaNue, State Senator, South Carolina

Flurry, Ruth C., Bureau Chief, Bureau Child and Parent Education, State Education Department, New York

Galvin, Marie, Director, Head Start/Day Care, Massachusetts

Garrison, James B., Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina

Garvin, Jean, Department of Education, Vermont

Geier, Mark, Program Assistant, Carnegie Corporation, New York
Gemma, Sr. Mary, R.S.M., Diocesan Supervisor, Diocese of Portland, Maine
Gerhart, Rolland C., Acting Director, Office of Child Development, Vermont
Germanowski, Glen Ko, Staff Representative, State Federation of Teachers, Massachusetts
Gibson, Gertha, State Day Care Training Director, Department of Human Resources, North Carolina
Gile, Mary Stuart, Consultant, Title I, ESEA, State Department of Education, New Hampshire
Gilles, Cynthia, Coordinator, Training, NESEIMC, Massachusetts
Gleason, David, Program Innovation Division, Office of Child Development, DHEW, Washington, D.C.
Gobley, Galen C., Research Analyst, Senate, Pennsylvania
Godfrey, Alice, Associate Director, Department of Public Health, Tennessee
Goldman, Joyce F., Editor, Day Care and Child Development Reports, Washington, D.C.
Goldman, Karla, Research Associate, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey
Gordon, Rita, Specialist, Children's Programs, Senate Office of Research, California
Gore, Jean S., Early Childhood Consultant, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, South Dakota
Graham, D. Robert, State Senator, Florida
Graves, David A., Director, Institute for Children, Department for Human Resources, Kentucky
Green, Ceclia, Executive Director, 4-C Program, New Jersey
Green, Jane, Project Director, Day Care Project, Office of Child Development, Department of Social Services, South Carolina
Gudger, Lamar, State Senator, North Carolina
Haberkorn, Floyd E., Assistant Executive Director, NAEYC, Washington, D.C.
Hager, Elizabeth S., State Representative, New Hampshire
Haldredge, M. Matthews, Sr., Secretary, Roger Williams Day Care, Rhode Island
Hale, Fran H., Director, Project Maine Stream Child Development Center, Maine
Hampton, Wayne, State Representative, Arkansas
Hantman, Stephen, Coordinator, Huron Institute T/A for OCD Developmental Continuity, Huron Institute, Massachusetts
Harris, Patrick B., State Representative, South Carolina
Harter, Michael, Director, Child Development Programs, Mt. St. Mary Hospital, Ohio
Haslinger, Lee W., Director, Early Childhood Education Programs, Michigan
Hatton, Joyce, President, Young World Inc., Michigan
Hauser, Pat., Program Specialist, Wayne County Child Care Coordinating Council, Michigan
Havel, James T., Legislative Consultant, Health Project, Michigan
Henderson, Mary, Assistant Director, Urban Coalition Right to Read, Delaware
Hewett, Kathyrn, ABT Associates, Massachusetts
Hirsch, Elizabeth, Early Childhood Educator, Region VI, Office for Children, Massachusetts
Hoepfner, Ralph, Director, Preschool Project Center for the Study of Education, UCLA, California
Holland, Edward M., State Senator, Virginia
Hopps, June, Deputy Director, Office of Programs and Educational Policy, Ohio

Hubbell, Ruth, Director, Child Development, Office of Education and Training, Mississippi
Huber, Katherine S., Director, Project Development, GCCAA, Michigan
Hull, Ann R., State Delegate, Maryland
Humphrey, Hubert H. III, State Senator, Minnesota
Isralowitz, Richard, Director, Human Services Development, New Jersey
Jackson, Nat, Special Assistant, Office of the Governor, Washington
James, Vernon G., Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
Jewett, Patricia A., Executive Director, Champlain Valley Family Development Corporation, Vermont
Johnson, Dale B., Legislative Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Office, Nebraska
Johnson, Trude, Chief, Day Care Division, Department of Community Affairs, Connecticut
Jones, Albert H., President, Delaware Board of Education, Delaware
Kasley, Doris, President, Council of Cooperative Nurseries, Michigan
Kelly, Ralph, State Senator, Nebraska
Kennelly, James P., Program Planner, Appalachian Regional Commission, Washington, D.C.
Kilmer, Sally, Child Development Planning, State Office, Minnesota
King, Barbara, Department of Education, Massachusetts
Klein, Jenny W., Director of Education Services, OCD, HEW, Washington, D.C.
Langen, Rexine A., Educational Consultant, Department of Public Instruction, Wisconsin
Lester, Juliette, Special Assistant, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
Levin, Patricia W., Director, Head Start, Pennsylvania
Liebergoit, Harvey, Director, Revisements and Information, BEH, Massachusetts
Lind, Jenny W., Assistant Division Administrator, Division of Family Services, Wisconsin
Lindquist, Fritz, AFT, Massachusetts
Litman, Frances, Assistant Professor, Wheelock College, Massachusetts
Long, E. Alison, Staff Member, Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, Massachusetts
Ludwig, Stephen B., Child Care Consultant, Department of Health and Welfare, Maine
Lund, Sylvia, Chairperson, State Board of Education, Maine
Mack, Helen, Child Care Services Coordinator, Mt. Calvary Family Development Day Care Center, Ohio
Marsh, Shirley, State Senator, Nebraska
Martin, Francis M., Staff Representative, Federation of Teachers, Massachusetts
Mathis, Carolyn, State Representative, North Carolina
Maura, Sister, R.S.M., Teacher, Diocese of Portland, Maine
Maureen, Sister, R.S.M., Teacher, Diocese of Portland, Maine
Maurer, Lucille, State Representative, Maryland
Maynard, Marjorie, Associate Consultant, Early Childhood Education, Department of Education, Connecticut
McDaniel, Harry W., Consultant, PATCO, Missouri
McDiarmid, Dorothy S., State Representative, Virginia
Messner, David, Chairman, Commonwealth Child Development Committee, Pennsylvania
Metger, Robert Earl, Child Development Coordinator, Appalachian Health Council, South Carolina
Miller, Stephen C., Attorney at Law, Education Law Center, Pennsylvania

Moore, Jennie L., Public Health Nursing Consultant, Department of Public Health, Tennessee
Moore, Jennie Lee, Nursing Supervisor, Upper Cumberland Child Development Project, Tennessee
Moore, Raymond S., President, Hewitt Research Center, Michigan
Morgan, Gwen, Vice President, Day Care and Child Development Council, Massachusetts
Mouton, John J., Acting Regional Program Director for Child Development, Office of Human Development, DHEW, Georgia
Mowles, Cynthia E., Consultant, Early Childhood Education, Division of Instruction, Department of Education, New Hampshire
Murphy, Cecile, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
Murphy, Sara, Coordinator, Office of Early Childhood Planning, Arkansas
Murray, Frank J., State Representative, Maine
Naddoff, George A., President, Living & Learning Schools, Massachusetts
Nock, Suzanne, Staff Assistant, Flint, Genesee County, 4-C, Michigan
North, Robert, State Senator, Minnesota
Northcott, Anne L., Research Evaluation and Planning Office, Maine
O'Conner, Kathleen, Project Management Specialist, Urban Affairs Department, Missouri
Ogden, Bruce, Consultant, Assembly Office of Research, California
Orlett, Edward J., State Representative, Ohio
Osborn, Charles D., Director, Curriculum Division, Department of Public Instruction, Indiana
Palmer, Louise, Legislative Assistant to Delegate Dorothy McDiarmid, Virginia
Park, Judy, Administrative Assistant, Head Start/Day Care, Massachusetts
Patten, Mary, Child Care Specialist, 4 C's, Montana
Patterson, Carson, Executive Director, Commission on Economic Opportunity, Michigan
Pautz, Harold D., Director, Child Development Services, Community Action Agency, Michigan
Penick, George D., Program Planner, Office of Child Development, North Carolina
Petsche, Mary M., Child Care Supervisor, Nebraska
Pettee, Robert H., Fiscal Officer, Office of Child Development, North Carolina
Pick, Ada, ECS Commissioner, New Mexico
Pierce, Priscilla, Director, Urban Coalition Right to Read, Delaware
Pierson, Marty, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
Pisani, Joseph R., State Senator, New York
Primm, Gloria J., Administrative Assistant, Carnegie Corp., New York
Prizer, Dana C., Consultant, Educational Projects, Inc., Washington, D.C.
Reed, Sereetta H., Chairman, State Commission, Children and Youth, Alabama
Reichert, Conrad A., Vice President for Research, Hewitt Research Center, Michigan
Rice, Gerri, Program Developer, Communities United for Action, Michigan
Roberts, Lowell, Assistant Director, Appalachian Child Development Project, New York
Robinson, Mary E., Coordinator, Early Childhood Education, State Department of Education, Maryland
Romer, William M., Director, Appalachian Child Development Project, New York
Rose, June, Research Associate, Huron Institute, Massachusetts
Rosen, Judith, Administrative Assistant, Office of the County Executive, Virginia

Rosenquest, Barbara, Resource Teacher, Roger Williams Day Care Center, Rhode Island
Rosenstreich, Judy, State Representative, Vermont
Rosenthal, Harold P., Assistant Director, Division of Youth and Family Services, New Jersey
Rosoff, Saul R., Acting Director, Office of Child Development, HEW, Washington, D.C.
Ross, Phylis, Assistant Head, National Council of Jewish Women, New York
Rude, Gordon, Health Consultant, Health Project, Michigan
Russell, Karlene, Director of Elementary and Secondary Education Instructional Service, State Department of Education, Vermont
Rustici, Jean, Early Childhood Consultant, State Department of Education, Connecticut
Ryan, Charlotte, President, PTSA, Massachusetts
Sanchez, David J., Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education, California
Sapinsley, Lila M., State Senator, Rhode Island
Sazer, Nina, State Coordinator, Children '76, New Hampshire
Scalera, Nicholas R., Assistant Director, Youth and Family Services, New Jersey
Schneider, Rev. Albert, Superintendent, Archdiocese of Santa Fe, New Mexico
Schneider, Dorothy, Coordinator, Flint-Genessee County 4-C, Michigan
Schwartz, B.D., State Representative, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
Schwartz, Susan, Administrative Assistant, Governor's Commission on Children and Youth, Maryland
Schwyn, Sally, Director, Commission on Economic Opportunity, Michigan
Scigaj, Maureen, Day Care Licensing Specialist, Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Family Services, Wisconsin
Seele, Helen, Director, Windham Area Head Start, Connecticut
Seguin, Florence, Program Associate, Home Start/Child and Family Resource Program/OCD/DHEW, Washington, D.C.
Seitzer, Robert H., Region 2 Commissioner, USOE, New York
Sharpe, Kennedy H., State Senator, North Carolina
Shaw, Elizabeth, State Senator, Iowa
Shea, James E., Assistant Secretary to the Governor, New York
Sherman, Edward, Director Child Development, Connecticut
Sherretts, Steven, Associate Psychologist, Psychiatric Institute, Nebraska
Shinn, Thomas V., ABT Associates, Massachusetts
Shurling, Ray, Commission on Children with Special Needs, North Carolina
Silver, Joyce, Research Assistant, Brookline Institute, Washington, D.C.
Smith, Jean D., Child Development Specialist, Office of Child Development, Tennessee
Smith, Marilyn M., Executive Director, NAEYC, Washington, D.C.
Smith, Teresa K., Child Care Specialist, Woonsocket Council of Community Services, Rhode Island
Smithberg, Lorraine, Follow-Through Program, Bank Street College, New York
Sohner, Linda, Program Specialist, ARC Child Development, Ohio
Staley, Carl C., Executive Director, United Day Care Services, North Carolina
Strickland, Tom, State Senator, North Carolina
Stromer, Gerald A., State Senator, Nebraska
Sweitzer, David, Child Development Coordinate, Office of Child Development, Tennessee
Tantum, Anne R., Director, Administrator and Supervision, Department of Education, New Jersey

Taylor, Don, Executive Director, Child Advocacy Council, Washington, D.C.
Taylor, Linda, Department for Human Resources, Bureau for Social Services, Kentucky
Taylor, Nan, National Board, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Connecticut
Taylor, Theodore, Executive Director, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Washington, D.C.
Teitelbaum, Mrs. M.D., Executive Director, 4-C Committee, Maryland
Thomas, Ora H., Executive Director, KCMC Day Care Center, Missouri
Thomas, Sharon, Program Specialist, Division of Family Services, Utah
Travis, Nancy W., Regional Director, Southwest Regional Office, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Georgia
Truan, Carlos, State Representative, Texas
Tufts, Jean, State Board of Education, New Hampshire
Varner, June, Child Development Specialist, Buckeye Hills, Hocking Valley Regional Development, Ohio
Walker, Ernest, Trainer Coordinator, Infant and Preschool Project, Kentucky
Ward, Betty, Administrative Assistant to the Governor, Oklahoma
Warner, Donna, Cost Effects Study, ABT Associates, Inc., Massachusetts
Wasai, Richard, State Representative and Chairman, House Education Committee, Hawaii
Weatherford, Robert, Special Assistant to U.S. Commission of Education, Virginia
Weekes, Nona, Early Childhood Education, Bank Street College, New York
Weinstein, Marlene, Director, Learning Center of the Medical College of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania
Weisberg, Allan, Department of Education, Massachusetts
Weisinger, Ron, Consultant, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Florida
White, James H., State Senator, Tennessee
White, Robert, Director, Division of Economic Opportunity, Oklahoma
Williams, Richards S., Research Educationalist, UCLA/CSE, California
Wilson, Dustin, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.
Winter, Mildred M., Director, Early Childhood Education, State Department of Education, Missouri
Wolff, Eliza, Assistant Director, Upper Cumberland Child Development Project, Tennessee
Wrightson, Frederick, Executive Director, Association for Child Development and Education, Massachusetts
Wriston, Michael, Day Care Program Consultant, Division of Social Services, SRS, Vermont
Yurchak, Mary Jane, Supervisor, Brookline Education Program, Massachusetts

Symposium Agenda

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31		
7-9:00 p.m.	Registration	Third Floor Foyer
THURSDAY, AUGUST 1		Third Floor Foyer
8:00 a.m.	Registration	
9:00 a.m.	Welcome and Introduction of Symposium Resource Consultants: Sally V. Allen, Director, ECS Department of Communications Opening Remarks: Mrs. Francis W. Sargent, Wife of the Governor of Massachusetts	Commonwealth
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break	
10:30 a.m.	"Reassessing Our Educational Priorities" Burton White, Director, Preschool Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Mass.	Commonwealth
12:00 Noon	Luncheon "Who Will Deliver Education to Preschool Children? The Need for a Policy Decision" Edwin Martin, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education	Fairfax
2:00 p.m.	"Organizing to Deliver Services: Alternative Approaches" Jule Sugarman, Chief Administrative Officer, Atlanta, Ga. Panelists: Benjamin Carmichael, Commissioner of Education, Tennessee Hubert Humphrey III, State Senator, Minnesota David Liederman, Director, Office for Children, Massachusetts Barbara Mosses, Chief of Contracts, Grants and Special Services Division, Department of Social Services, South Carolina	Commonwealth

4-5:30 p.m. **Workshops**

These seminars are intended to encourage full and open discussion among all participants.

- *Day Care Licensing* — Independence East

Sam Granato, Day Care Officer, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Margaret Sanstad, Day Care Specialist, Office of Child Development, Region X, Seattle, Wash.
Melissa Tillman, Director, Day Care Licensing and Consulting Unit, Office for Children, Massachusetts

- *Needs Assessment* — Independence Center

John Hawes, Executive Director, Learning Institute of North Carolina
David Nesenholtz, Planning Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, Texas
Howard Schrag, Director, Office of Child Development, Idaho

- *Child Abuse and Neglect* — Independence West

Brian Fraser, Staff Attorney, National Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect

4-5:30 p.m. **Meet the Experts**

Resource consultants will be available for informal discussion on the following topics:

- *Child Health Services* — Berkeley A

Frederick Green, Associate Director, Children's Hospital National Medical Center, and Director of the center's Office for Child Health Advocacy
Wendy Lazarus, Health Specialist, Children's Defense Fund

THURSDAY *(Continued)*

- Child Health Services *(Continued)*

  Richard Rowe, Associate Professor, Clinical Psychology and Public Practice Program, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Mass.

- *Services for Handicapped Children* — Berkeley B

  Gene Hensley, Director, Handicapped Children's Education Project (HACHE), Education Commission of the States

- *Organizing at the State Level* — Clarendon A

  John Himelrick, Director, Interagency Council for Child Development Services, West Virginia

  Jerome Hughes, State Senator and Chairman, Senate Education Committee, Minnesota

  Jeannette Watson, Director, Office of Early Childhood Development, Texas

- *Developing Statewide Grass Roots Support* — Clarendon B

  Judith Meredith, Former Director of Community Development, Office for Children, Mass.

- *Recent Federal Programs*

  Education for Parenthood — Dalton A

  Dollie Lynch Wolverton, Program Planning Specialist, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

  Home Start and the Child and Family Resource Program — Dalton B

  Ann O'Keefe, Director, Home Start and Child and Family Resource Program, Office of Child Development, Office of Human Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

THURSDAY *(Continued)*

6:30 p.m.	No-Host Reception	Commonwealth
8:30 p.m.	"Families and Children: Why Do We Ignore Their Needs?" Walter F. Mondale, U.S. Senator, Minnesota	Independence

FRIDAY, AUGUST 2

8:45 a.m.	"Organizing to Deliver Services: The Public School System" Moderator: Barbara Finberg, Carnegie Corporation of New York Panelists: Bettye Caldwell, Center for Early Development and Education, University of Arkansas James Gallagher, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina Donald Pierson, Brookline Early Education Project, Massachusetts	Commonwealth
10:30 a.m.	"Day Care and Cost Effectiveness: A National Overview and a Case Study" Moderator: John Niemeyer, President Emeritus, Bank Street College of Education, New York City, and President, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C. Richard Ruopp, Vice President, Abt Associates, Inc., and Director of the National Cost Effectiveness Day Care Study for the U.S. Office of Child Development Mary Rowe, Special Assistant to the President and Chancellor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Commonwealth

FRIDAY *(Continued)*

	Day Care and Cost Effectiveness *(Continued)* Irma Garay, Director, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, New York City Gardenia White, Training Consultant, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, New York City Jacqueline Monthe, Classroom Teacher, Children's Pump House Day Care Center, New York City	
12:15 p.m.	Luncheon Speaker: Dale Bumpers, Governor of Arkansas	Independence
2:15 p.m.	Adjournment	

ECS STEERING COMMITTEE
1974-1975

Chairman
David Hall, Governor of Oklahoma

Vice Chairman
Hope Kading, Chairman, State PTA Legislative Committee, Idaho

Chairman-Elect
Arch A. Moore Jr., Governor of West Virginia

Treasurer
Bennett D. Katz, State Senator, Maine

Members
Reubin O'D. Askew, Governor of Florida
Christopher S. Bond, Governor of Missouri
Otis R. Bowen, Governor of Indiana
Winfield Dunn, Governor of Tennessee
J. James Exon, Governor of Nebraska
John J. Gilligan, Governor of Ohio
Hunter B. Andrews, State Senator, Virginia
Gilbert E. Bursley, State Senator, Michigan
Joseph C. Harder, Senate Majority Leader, Kansas
Gordon Sandison, State Senator, Washington
Constance E. Cook, State Assemblywoman, New York
Leroy F. Greene, State Assemblyman, California
Floyd M. Sack, State Representative, Colorado
Pete Turnham, State Representative, Alabama
Shiro Amioka, College of Education, University of Hawaii
Robert S. Babcock, Former Provost, Vermont State Colleges
William P. Bittenbender, Chairman, State Board of Education, New Hampshire
Cyril B. Busbee, State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina
Joseph M. Cronin, Secretary of Educational Affairs, Massachusetts
Karl F. Grittner, Principal, Johnson High School, St. Paul, Minn.
Calvin Hart, Principal, Intermediate School 147, Bergenfield, N.J.
Katherine Hurley, Chairman, State Board of Education, Alaska
Bill J. Priest, Chancellor, Dallas County Junior College District, Texas
The Rev. John P. Raynor, S.J., President, Marquette University, Wisconsin
Robert G. Schrader, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wyoming
Eldra L. M. Shulterbrandt, Trustee, College of the Virgin Islands

Advisory Members
Rafael Hernandez Colon, Governor of Puerto Rico
Edwin W. Edwards, Governor of Louisiana
Philip W. Noel, Governor of Rhode Island
Jeanette F. Reibman, State Senator, Pennsylvania
Ruth O. Truex, State Senator, Connecticut
B. G. Hendrix, State Representative, Arkansas
James H. Koch, State Representative, New Mexico
Terry Mann, State Representative, Kentucky
Mrs. M. Richmond Farring, Member, Board of Education, Baltimore, Md.
William C. Friday, President, University of North Carolina
Sue Healy, Teacher, South Junior High School, Rapid City, S.D.
Roy E. Lieuallen, Chancellor, State System of Higher Education, Oregon
Darld J. Long, Executive Director, Utah School Boards Association
Mrs. Ray E. Miller, Chairman, State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, North Dakota
Stanley F. Redeker, Former President, State Board of Regents, Iowa

Education Commission of the States

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-seven states and territories are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among state governors, legislators and educators for the improvement of education. The Commission offices are located at 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.